PANELS OF THE
VIIth WORLD SANSKRIT CONFERENCE
GENERAL EDITOR: JOHANNES BRONKHORST

VOLUME I

THE SANSKRIT TRADITION AND TANTRISM

EDITED BY

TEUN GOUDRIAAN



PANELS OF THE VIIth WORLD SANSKRIT CONFERENCE

VOL. I

The Sanskrit Tradition and Tantrism

PANELS OF THE VIIth WORLD SANSKRIT CONFERENCE

Kern Institute, Leiden: Augustus 23-29, 1987

General Editor: JOHANNES BRONKHORST

VOL. I

The Sanskrit Tradition and Tantrism



THE SANSKRIT TRADITION AND TANTRISM

EDITED BY

TEUN GOUDRIAAN



E.J. BRILL
LEIDEN • NEW YORK • KØBENHAVN • KÖLN
1990

ISBN 90 04 09245 5

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

Table of Contents

Preface of the general editor

The VIIth World Sanskrit Conference was held in August 1987, at the Kern Institute in Leiden. Workshops, or panels, constituted one of its special features. Twenty of these were held, each dealing with a different linguistic or cultural issue.

The well-defined themes of these panels, and the focused contributions of their participants made it desirable to provide the possibility for their publication in separate volumes. In certain cases it has been decided to join two panels into one volume, and some panel-conveners preferred not to take advantage of the opportunity offered. Nevertheless some ten volumes are expected to appear in the near future.

The budget available for the publication of these volumes has been small. This has caused numerous unforeseen obstacles, unavoidable delays, and even more work for everyone involved. Thanks are due to all those who endured these hardships and contributed to the success of this endeavour, most of all to Ms. Judith A. Louwes-van der Laan, who prepared the camera-ready text without ever loosing her good cheer. Dr. F.Th. Dijkema, of Brill Publishers, who never tired of assisting with his advice, should also be mentioned here.

J.B.

Just before the corrected proofs were sent to the press, news came of the sudden death of one of our contributors, Jan Schoterman. Jan was an enthusiastic investigator and a cheerful, stimulating personality. We shall not forget him.

T.G.

Preface

That Tantric studies are coming of age is shown by the increasing number of Indologists who occupy themselves with Tantric doctrinal tenets and ritual traditions; the recent editions and translations of texts; the investigation of various details hitherto unknown or neglected; the tendency to rehabilitation of this aspect of Indian religious history in the minds of scholars.

It is a matter of gratification that the Organizing Committee of the VIIth International Conference of the I.A.S.S. accepted a panel on the subject "The Sanskrit Tradition and Tantrism", a fact which underlines the growing importance of this recent offshoot of Sanskritic studies. Besides, several participants of the Conference submitted papers on Tantric subjects.

The present volume contains the revised versions of the six papers presented at the mentioned panel (the articles by H. Brunner, V.V. Dvivedi, D. Heilijgers-Seelen, A. Padoux, Sh. Tsuda, G. Wojtilla), of two papers read in the Section on Āgamas and Tantras of the IASS Conference (those by G. Colas and S. Schwarz-Linder), and two other articles prepared for the occasion by T. Goudriaan and J.A. Schoterman.

The purpose has been to present a collection of articles of wide scope - within the limits imposed by the title of the panel - so as to cover different aspects of the Tantric tradition as studied in various parts of our world. Nevertheless, the contributors are predominantly from Western Europe, while the study of the Kubjikāmata as pursued at Utrecht in the Netherlands has received a special emphasis, a situation largely explainable by the fact that the Conference was held at Leiden.

Despite the progress in Tantric studies sketched above, several new aspects are brought to the fore in the following contributions. In the first article, Hélène Brunner, examining the double nature of the ritual worship in the Śaiva Āgama tradition, formulates the interesting hypothesis, that these two types of worship ("worship for others", commonly called "public worship" or "temple worship", and "worship for oneself", commonly called "private worship"), seemingly of common stock, have in fact derived from quite different origins. The former type of pūjā would have originated from rites practised by village communities, the latter type form the personal ritual of sādhakas. In this way the article is also relevant to the intricate problem of the relation between the ritual and ideology of the Sanskrit Āgamas and Tantras on the one hand and the varieties of popular cult on the other hand.

The relationship between subsects of the Vaiṣṇava Āgama is studied by Gérard Colas from Vaikhānasa sources. The Vaikhānasa authors, who claim

to belong to a Vedic tradition, give us some clues as to the characteristics of "vaidika" or "tāntrika" in the schools relevant to their own position (especially Pāñcarātra and Bhāgavata). It appears that very subtle classifications were sometimes applied (often connected with questions of initiation); such data may offer new insights into the interrelation of religious communities.

André Padoux, also studying the ritual sphere, investigates the nature and function of an aspect of ritual "body language". Concentrating on Kaula texts of the Śaiva and Śākta denomination, he shows how the visual aspect of the mudrās or hand-poses is inseparable from the performers' spiritual attitudes and the manifestations of the deity expressed and evoked by them. In this way, the mudrās appear to be complex, "holistic" devices which reflect - and reproduce - the worshipper's experience of the divinity approached by him.

Vraj Vallabh Dvivedi gives a general survey of the main lines of development of Tantric religion, stressing the distinctive features of its tradition and its relation to some aspects of Vedism. According to him, Tantrism is characterized by liberal viewpoints, tolerance of different religious traditions, preference of spiritual development to external ritualism. The doctrines of human dignity and equality are foreshadowed in Tantric teachings on the luminous, divine self, the power of reasoning and the importance of compassion, harmony and mutual understanding.

An aspect of the divinity of the human self is outlined by Dory Heilijgers in her treatment of the doctrine of the six mystic centres according to the Kubjikā school. The basic text of this school, the Kubjikāmatatantra, already presents a developed theory on these internal Cakras (distinguishing an *uttara* and *dakṣiṇa* variety) which in many aspects resembles the "classical" system but is definitely more archaic and may even be its origin and first representant. The Kubjikā system of Cakras is preoccupied with sound mysticism and pays little or no attention to Kuṇḍalinīyoga in its later form.

A problem of Tantric textology concerning the mentioned Kubjikāmatatantra is discussed by Jan Schoterman. A careful study of the perhaps oldest preserved manuscript of this Tantra shows that it contains a shorter, partly independent version which might also be called "purer" because it does not contain some chapters which may have been borrowed from non-Kubjikā Tantras by the longer version. In certain respects, however, the shorter version (Laghvikāmnāya) seems to contain secondary features; it is also closer to oral tradition. The preliminary conclusions reached by Schoterman might also be of interest for the study of other Tantric textual traditions.

As in some other Tantras, we find in the Kubjikāmatatantra that the main subjects of revelation (sound mysticism, internal pantheon, visualisations etc.) are sometimes interrupted or rather adorned by fragmentary descriptions of mythical or allegorical character. One of these, concerning the position of the Ātman, is commented upon by Teun Goudriaan with special reference to its Vedic and Epic prototypes.

An aspect of the mythical tradition of Śāktism is dealt with by Silvia Schwarz who studies the revelation of the 108 names of Tripurā to her son Kāma in the Tripurārahasya. The article is a welcome contribution to the neglected subject of Tantric stotra production. The 108 names are communicated in the form of a stotra of fifteen syllables (the number fifteen being of special importance in the Śrīvidyā school) which in concealed form also contains a less known variant of the Kāmamantra of the school. The discussion of some of the Goddess' epithets in this stotra makes clear that we have here to do with a "theology in nuce".

Buddhist Tantrism is represented by a study of the cult of the cremation-ground (*śmaśāna*) conducted by Shinichi Tsuda. This cult, which is repeatedly referred to in Hindu texts such as the Vetālapañcaviṃśatikā, is discussed with special reference to the Saṃvarodaya and Hevajra Tantras. The teaching culminates in the Saṃvara-maṇḍala of sixty-two deities which reveals "the bipolar structure of *avidyā* and *vidyā* of the dharma of feminine singular".

The article by Gyula Wojtilla deals with a sometimes despised, but nonetheless most real, aspect of Tantrism: the application - with full understanding of their deep structure and meaning - of mantras for earthly objectives. The article contains and discusses a selection of mantras of Cāmuṇḍā (aimed at subjugation of human beings) from little-known texts of the Kāmaśāstra tradition. The author also outlines relations with social realities as appearing from Sanskrit texts (descriptions of procuresses resembling Cāmuṇḍā) and modern sources on the problems of tribal cultures.

I have followed a liberal policy with respect to minor matters of spelling of Sanskrit words etc. The reader's indulgence is asked regarding small inconsequences which thus may appear in the volume. Printing errors are the responsibility of the editor, not of the authors.

A word of gratitude is due to Sanjukta Gupta for her English translation of V.V. Dvivedi's article.

Utrecht, april 1988 Teun Goudriaan

Ātmārthapūjā versus Parārthapūjā in the Śaiva tradition

Hélène Brunner

I. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to try to clarify the connection, structural and historical, between the two forms of worship which exist side by side in the Śaiva tradition (and in other forms of Hinduism as well): the "worship for oneself" (*ātmārthapūjā*), which we may call "private worship", and the "worship for others" (*parārthapūjā*), often termed "public worship" and exemplified by temple cults.

I shall first of all define the two terms with precision, pointing out some peculiar cases and exposing the most common misunderstandings. Then I shall compare the rituals concerned in various respects, taking solely into account the daily worship (*nityakarman*), and, in this *nityakarman*, the *śivapūjā* alone. While insisting on the parallelism of the two forms of cult, I shall explain the raison d'être of the few differences that do exist. This will constitute the factual part of my paper.

On the basis of this description, a critical part will follow: starting from the discovery of some incongruities in our model (some rites seem to be out of place either in this or that context), and also from patent contradictions in the āgamic teachings concerning the *ācārya*. I shall be led to the conclusion that it is certainly a mistake to imagine that the *ātmārthapūjā* and the *parārthapūjā* are only two versions of a unique model of cult, which would always have comprised the same constitutive elements; and that we on the contrary should understand the āgamic form of *pūjā* as resulting from the combination of two previously independent types of worship, one "private", the other "public". These two influenced each other in the course of history, and the texts we have describe a situation where a common structure has been framed and the original characteristics of each cult are almost completely obliterated. I shall not attempt to solve the problem of the relative age of both cults. I shall only try to see through the āgamic descriptions and figure out the main features of what I deem to be the pre-āgamic forms of cults. This second part of my paper will of course consist principally of hypotheses, but I think they are acceptable, at least as working tools. To end, I shall add a list of questions concerning the development of Śaivism, which cannot be answered in the present state of research.

II. Sources

My inquiry will be mainly philological, and be based preferably on the oldest among the available texts: the Śaivāgamas of the Siddhānta school (whose redaction must have taken place between the 6th or 7th century and the 9th century) and the first among the *paddhatis* written on the basis of these Āgamas: those anterior to the 13th century.[1] For only by resorting to the most ancient descriptions of Śaiva cults may we hope to have a guess on their inceptive forms.

The Āgamas and handbooks I shall rely on may be divided into two groups: the texts of the first group (*Mṛgendra, Mataṅga*, etc.) are solely concerned with *ātmārthapūjā*, while the texts of the second group (*Kāmika, Ajita*, etc.) deal mainly with the *parārthapūjā*.[2] The first ones do not even mention the so-called "public" worship; the second ones do mention the private worship, indicating sometimes the changes (deletions and simplifications) that should be brought to their descriptions in order that they apply to the *ātmārthapūjā*. Most of the first fall within the class of Upāgamas, most of the others, within the class of Mūlāgamas.[3] This distribution however is not absolute and we cannot rely too heavily on it - not more than on the rule which is given in the second group of texts and seeks to justify this fact, to wit, that the *ātmārthapūjā* may be performed with the help of an Upāgama, while the *parārthapūjā* must necessarily be done following a Mūlāgama. I believe this to be a late view. Whatever the case, it would certainly be a mistake to interpret the subdivision of Śaivāgamas into Mūlāgamas and Upāgamas in terms of historical sequence.

Actually, most of the texts I know do not inform us that they deal with this or that form of worship. It is left to the reader to find it out, by a survey of the contents. Moreover, many Āgamas or handbooks present their descriptions of *śivapūjā* as if they should apply indifferently to both types of cults. They do not draw any dividing line between private and temple worship, but define a scale of values for the *pūjās*, according to any given criterium, and they may add that the lowest types are acceptable for *ātmārthapūjā* only.

So, the general impression that we derive from our sources is that there is *one* model for the cult of Śiva, be it performed privately or in a temple. I shall presently develop this point.

III. Definitions

Let me beforehand consider the two terms we are using, and give their definitions.

The first and only correct definitions are derived from etymology:

- the *ātmārthapūjā*, or *svārthapūjā*, is the cult performed "for oneself", i.e. the cult whose fruit goes to the worshipper;
- the *parārthapūjā* is the cult done "for others", i.e. the cult the fruit of which goes to a person other than the worshipper.

These definitions are found in many texts.[4] But we also meet with other, more pragmatic, ones which say that:

- the *ātmārthapūjā* is the cult one performs in private, on one's personal image of Śiva, which is usually the movable *liṅga* one has received from the *guru* on the day of the *dīkṣā*;
- the *parārthapūjā* is the cult performed in a temple, on the steady image of Śiva sheltered in the inner sanctuary, by an officiating priest (*gurukkal* in Tamilnadu).

Such definitions, which bring in concrete features, like the place of the worship and the nature of the image, are also given in Āgamas.[5] In fact, they have practically superseded the previous ones; and it is these which will be taken into consideration in what follows. I shall consequently speak of "private worship" and "temple worship". We must however observe that these definitions are not strictly equivalent to the first ones, and therefore not strictly correct. I shall explain why.

1) First, one may perform a *parārthapūjā* on a movable image, and even outside any temple: (a) The cults performed by temple priests, during festivals, on any movable image of Śiva are naturally *parārtha* - but I shall not insist on them, for the movable image of Śiva which is then used has no independent existence apart from the immovable *liṅga* of the inner sanctuary, and the cult it receives is actually addressed to that *liṅga*. (b) Lesser known, the cult which any initiate, when temporarily prevented from worship (for reason of impurity or disease), has someone perform on his own movable image is, strictly speaking, a *parārthapūjā* too, since it is done by another person than the beneficiary.

2) Conversely, there are instances of *ātmārthapūjās* using immovable images, erected in temples. The most interesting case is that of the *sādhaka*, that is to say, the initiate who has received a special consecration qualifying him for the exclusive worship of a chosen deity, in view of a special achievement[6] - let us say *siddhi*. His cultic image is often a movable or temporary one. But we learn from several sources[7] that he could also have a steady *liṅga* erected and a temple built (unless he finds a suitable one already existing) and, having performed (generally himself) the necessary *pratiṣṭhā*, use this *liṅga* for his own cult, until the advent of the desired result - or even beyond. Although totally forgotten in our time, the procedure was not at all exceptional; and there are still living traditions concerning temples, now "public", but originally installed by

sādhakas, and which derive their actual renown from the *siddhis* which were acquired there in the past. It is clear that, in olden times, the *siddhis*-seeking *sādhakas* were numerous, probably the most important of all Śaiva initiates.

In spite of the exceptions I have stated, it remains true that the terms *ātmārthapūjā* and *parārthapūjā* correspond practically to "private worship" and "temple worship". (I would not say "domestic", for the *ātmārthapūjā* has nothing to do with the family. And I would not say "public" for two reasons: first, the temple cult is not open to all eyes, especially some of its stages; second, the presence of a "public" is completely indifferent, the performance being exactly the same whether there are witnesses or not.)

Now, a few words of warning may be useful, concerning the term "private worship". While the *ātmārthapūjā* proper is performed by a person duly initiated and according to strict rules, there are cases when these rules are ignored; the worship is then reduced to a few tokens of devotion that all devotees (women, children, non initiated persons) are allowed to offer. It is not of this kind of worship I am going to speak. Neither shall I be concerned with the homages that individuals may offer to the God of the immovable image of a temple through the agency of officiating priests. Sometimes termed "private worships", these *arcanas*, or even full *pūjās*, do not fall within the category of *ātmārthapūjā*. One could rather regard them as *parārthapūjās* of a simplified type - but they are not even cautioned by the texts we know.

Finally, I shall add for those who are better versed in Vedic than in Tantric ritual, that the relation between *ātmārthapūjā* and *parārthapūjā* is not parallel to the relation between Vedic *śrauta*- and *gṛhyakarman*.

IV. Resemblance and difference between the two forms of cults.

Let us now compare in various respects the *ātmārthapūjā* and the *parārthapūjā*.

1) From the structural point of view, the resemblance is evident. As I have said, it is accepted as a postulate by almost all Āgamas. The appended chart gives in the first column the main phases of the daily *śivapūjā* as described by a master of the XIth century, Somaśambhu, for *ātmārthapūjā* as well as for *parārthapūjā*. The same model exactly can be found in Āgamas or Tantras dealing with the first (*Mṛgendra*, *Svacchanda*, etc.)[8] and in Āgamas dealing with the second (*Kāmika*, etc.).[9] The second and third column show the modifications which, according to some sources, one should bring to this model in case of *ātmārthapūjā* (col.2) or *parārthapūjā* (col.3).

Simplified Model of *Śivanityapūja* (according to Somaśambhu)			Possible Modifications in case of	
			Ātmārtha	*Parārtha*
I	*Dvārapūjā* (includes *vighnoccāṭana*); *Śivadhāmapraveśa*		d	
II	*Pañcaśuddhi:*	*ātmaśuddhi*, followed by *śivīkaraṇa* and *antaryāga*		
		sthānaśuddhi		
		dravyaśuddhi (preceded by the preparation of *arghya*)		different types of *arghya*
		mantraśuddhi		
		liṅgaśuddhi		
III	*Bāhyapūjā*	1. *āsanapūjā* and *mūrtinyāsa*		
		2. *āvāhanādi* (*āvāhana, sthāpana, sannidhāna, nirodhana, avakuṇṭhana, amṛtīkaraṇa*)		
		3. *aṅganyāsa*		
		4. *upacāras* - *pādya, ācamanīya, arghya, puṣpa*		
		- *snāna*	s	el.
		- *āvaraṇapūjā*		
		- *dhūpa, dīpa*		el.
		- *naivedyādi*		el.
		- *darpaṇādi*		+ *nīrājana*, etc.*
		- *pavitra*		
		5. *japa, japanivedana*		
		6. *pradakṣiṇa, namaskāra*		
		7. *agnikārya*		+ *parivārārcana*
		8. *balidāna*	d	el. + *nityotsava*
		9. *karmanivedana, visarjana*		
IV	*Caṇḍapūjā*		d	

(d = deleted, s = simplified, el. = elaborated)

* *nīrājana, bhasman, chattra, cāmara, tālavṛnta*

One can see that some authors are of the opinion that *dvārapūjā*, *balidāna* and *caṇḍapūjā* should be omitted in private worship, though many others consider them as necessary in all cases. The most commonly accepted simplifications concern the bath (*snāna* or *abhiṣeka*) and the services which follow the meal (*naivedya*), which need not be elaborated (but may be so) in private worship, while they are preferably so in temple cult. Besides, some extra rites are then compulsorily performed (*nīrājana*, *bhasmanivedana*, outside *balidāna* and *nityotsava*), some others highly recommended (music and dance for instance).

It is easy to account for these differences. Some of the rites which seem to be characteristic of temple ritual are simply demanded by the existence of a concrete building, with a door, etc. (I am not considering for the present the structures outside the *garbhagṛha*.) Most of them however must be explained on other grounds: first, by the comparative openness of the temple, which is much less sheltered from evil eye and intrusions than the spot selected for his *pūjā* by the private worshipper; secondly, by the greater interest that Malevolent Powers evince for temple cult, compared with a private *pūjā*: if they succeed in disturbing the ritual, the resulting evil will be bigger, and their victory of more weight. Hence, the multiplication of defensive as well as offensive rites (*vighnoccāṭana*, etc.), of purificatory rites (elaborated *snāna*, *nīrājana*, etc.) and of ceremonies (*balidāna*, etc.) intended to placate the most dangerous of the Gods or Demons inhabiting the temple. Almost all the complexities of the *parārthapūjā* actually performed in temples could be explained in this manner, though it is a truth few people know, or perhaps would admit. The private cult comprises rites of the same kind, but very much simpler.

As a result, the temple *pūjā* will naturally be longer than the private one, a phenomenon which is still amplified by the usually greater abundance of offerings, of oblations in fire, etc. But there is no strict rule in this respect, for no one prevents individual worshippers from developing their cults. This is actually the case with the *sādhakas*, who, on the one hand, think that abundant offerings are a guarantee for quick success, and on the other hand must protect their cult very carefully, being especially exposed to attacks by Demons jealous of the powers they are getting. Conversely, there are small temples where the daily cult is reduced to the minimum and is even simpler than the normal private cult.

The same situation obtains regarding the number of *pūjās* in the day. Generally - but not necessarily - they are multiplied in temples (up to eight: the bigger the temple, the more numerous the *pūjās*), while a private worshipper will be content with one full *pūjā* a day. In both

cases, regularity is an absolute requisite, and there are *prāyaścittas* in case of delay or omission.

Now, if we look outside the inner sanctuary of a temple and take into account the exterior structures, we shall find there a variable number of divinities who have to be worshipped every day, even though this worship be reduced to the recitation of some *mantras* with the accompaniment of flowers. It goes without saying that their presence gives the temple ritual, taken as a whole, a dimension which is unknown to the private cult. But this aspect need not to be considered for the comparison we are attempting. This is why I shall reduce, so to say, the temple to its *garbhagṛha* - a reduction which, by the way, restores it probably to its most ancient form, or nearly so.

I shall operate a similar simplification regarding the time, taking into consideration the sole daily worship, and neglecting the periodical and exceptional ceremonies. In spite of a different coloration and of the incorporation therein of important elements which seem to come from elsewhere and make their interest, these rituals are entirely dependent on the *nityapūjā*.

2) Let us now regard the image which serves as a support for the cult. The main rule is that it should be movable (or temporary) for private worship, and immovable for temple cults.[10] Movable or temporary images are also used in temples when the necessity arises, that is to say, when Śiva has either to multiply himself, or to move. But all these movable images are dependent on the fixed image of the sanctuary, which alone represents Śiva as "proprietor" of the temple. For we must always remember that the temple is the House of God, before anything the sociologist may discover besides.

As for the form of this image, the most highly praised and actually the commonest is the *liṅga* without features (named *niṣkala*); but others are possible too: *liṅgas* with faces (*mukhaliṅgas*) and statues (named *pratimā* or *sakalaliṅgas*) for temples; *maṇḍalas* (made of powders), *yantras* (inscribed on solid material), painted images (*citras*), water-pots, etc., and all the impermanent *liṅgas* (of sand, boiled rice, flowers, and so on) for private cults[11] - not to speak of the worshipper himself, who is Śiva for the duration of the cult.

The material out of which these images may be made is not the same according as they are movable or immovable, temporary or permanent; but the lists of acceptable substances vary with he texts and no significant difference contrasting, in this respect, the image for *ātmārthapūjā* with the one for *parārthapūjā*, could be pointed out with certainty.[12]

It is worthy of notice that the form of the concrete image has no influence whatever on the cult performed with its help. The phases of the

pūjā are always the same (with one exception: when the image cannot stand water, a substitute has to be found for the ritual bathing) and, above all, the Divine Form of Śiva which is to be contemplated at the moment of Invocation does not depend on the concrete representation. In fact, many various forms of the God are possible, but they depend on the aim of the cult (and therefore concern only the *sādhakas*), not on the material icon which the worshipper is facing.

There is however one characteristic of the cult which is linked to the nature of the concrete support of worship, but it does not contrast *ātmārthapūjā* with *parārthapūjā*, it contrasts the cult on a temporary image with the cult on a permanent one: the Invocation (*āvāhana*) and the Dismissal (*visarjana*) are absolute in the first case, relative only in the second.[13]

3) As for the avowed aims of the two cults, they are clearly different: the *ātmārthapūjā* is performed for the benefit of one person alone (the performer), while the *parārthapūjā* in a temple is performed for the benefit of all.[14] This benefit may of course be of the same kind here and there: prosperity, security, happiness, etc.; but the private worship has often a more definite aim: either a special achievement (worldly or other-worldly *bhukti*) for a *sādhaka*, or the liberation (*mukti*) for the other initiates, *ācāryas*, *putrakas* and *samayins*. As for the temple cult (except when a temple is used for himself by a *sādhaka*), it is never linked with achievements of single individuals, it is performed for the good of the country as a whole, the Prince being only the first among all the beneficiaries. And this good naturally takes the form of physical and psychological comfort. This is the sole reason why a temple is built in a village, in a town, or elsewhere in the country. The idea behind is very simple: the ritual pleases God, who in return extends his protection to the country. If individuals derive some benefits from their connection with the temple, so much the better - but this is only a side-effect. The same may be said of the social function that the temple may eventually fulfil. However useful and important it may be, this function is only accidental, not essential.

4) A last angle of comparison concerns the qualifications of the worshipper. Both performers of *ātmārtha-* and *parārthapūjā* must first of all receive a *dīkṣā*, which usually includes several steps. Having dealt at great length with this subject in my translation of *Somaśambhupaddhati*,[15] I shall not enter into details here. Let it be enough to recall that, while this *dīkṣā* is sufficient for *ātmārthapūjā*,[16] a consecration into "master-ship" (*ācāryābhiṣeka*) is deemed necessary for *parārthapūjā*. But we are faced here with a difficulty, for this last statement, which is of course to be found only in the texts dealing with *parārthapūjā*, clashes with the

description of the prerogatives of the *ācārya* as given in the chapters dealing with his *abhiṣeka*, whatever the group of texts they belong to. We will return later to this important question.

Actually, the texts which speak of temple cults impose another condition on the officiating priest: not only should he be a *brāhmaṇa* (which is not a requisite for *ātmārthapūjā*), but he should also be an Ādiśaiva, or Śivabrāhmaṇa - that is to say, a descendant in direct line of one of the five sages who, according to the Āgamas, were initiated directly by Śiva at the beginning of the creation.[17] This rule cannot be very old, for there are several Āgamas and *paddhatis* which ignore this concept of Ādiśaiva, though dealing with temple cults; but it has become generally accepted in Tamilnādu. In later time, it has further narrowed, and the choice of the *ācāryas* of a big temple is nowadays restricted to a few families only, among the Ādiśaivas of the town.

To conclude the first part of my enquiry: what out texts teach us is that the cult of Śiva is a ritual whose essential features are the same, whether the practitioner worships for his own sake or for the others' - the few relevant differences concerning the stability of the image and the qualifications of the performer.

V. Some anomalies and problems.

It is but normal that we should ask ourselves, at this juncture, whether the strict parallelism between private and temple cults, that the Āgamas affirm, has always existed. Some anomalies, which I am now going to point out, apparently call for a negative answer.

1) Some stages of the cult, as described in our model, do not seem to fit both contexts equally well.

a) In private cult, the following rites appear out of place:

- The worship of the door and of its divinities. The *pūjā* is performed either outside (it was probably the normal case in old days) or in the corner of a room. Why imagine an inexisting door that one has to pass (rite of *śivadhāmapraveśana*) by striding over the threshold, etc.? If one objects that it is but normal to fancy a boundary separating the space occupied by God and the worshipper from the space around, I shall reply that the delimitation of a sacred area as well as its protection are assured by rites which will be done anyhow;[18] and that, while a limitation is a necessity (it often takes the form of a mantric wall of Astras), a door, that is to say an opening that Malevolent Powers might well use to enter, is not so - unless one has in mind the model of the temple cult.

- The offering of *balis*. In temples, *balis* are offered daily in the *prākāras* outside the inner sanctuary, to a host of divinities who normally inhabit these precincts, having been ritually installed there when the temple has been consecrated. In private cults, they are distributed (to a smaller but fixed number of divinities) on two *maṇḍalas*, drawn on the ground, near the fire-pit.[19] We may make two remarks. (1) There are no such divinities installed, together with Śiva, in the *pūjā*-room of the private devotee. (2) Even if one thinks that they may easily answer to the call and help themselves on the *maṇḍalas*,[20] and that it is wise on the part of the worshipper to satisfy them, still the rite looks like something artificially introduced; for *balis* have nothing to do with *homa*, and the arrangement made for the convenience of the private worshipper breaks the well-ordained structure of the *pūjā*.
- The cult of Caṇḍa, to whom are brought the remains (*nirmālya*) of the offerings made to Śiva. Caṇḍa alone may receive, without being harmed, the *nirmālya* coming from a man-made, immovable *liṅga*.[21] Now, all texts agree that the *nirmālya* of one's movable *liṅga* is not dangerous for the worshipper. So, why Caṇḍa? And why the presentation of the *nirmālya* to him?

It is noticeable that these three items are sometimes declared unnecessary in private worship,[22] a decision which shows that my argumentation is supported by some Śaiva masters.

b) In temple ritual, there are different phases which seem to me out of place.

- The clearest case is that of the *japa*, which is enjoined at the end of the cult. This repetition of a *mantra* (or a set of *mantras*) is characteristically a private affair. Obviously devised for the *sādhaka*, of whom it is the best tool for submitting a divinity (or identifying with Him or Her), the *japa* is still understandable in the case of a *mumukṣu* worshipping privately, for it helps him (at least, such is the contention) to obtain the desired identification with Śiva, which is called liberation. But how are we to justify this rite in a temple cult, more especially as the practitioner has already done his *japa* during his private *pūjā*? What kind of effect could it have? And what is the meaning of its offering to Śiva with the very verses used by the private worshipper, which strongly convey the idea of a personal transaction?[23]
- The process by which the officiating priest transforms himself into Śiva at the beginning of the cult could also be looked on with suspicion, the more so when one sees how it is done nowadays. More generally, all the *yoga* exercises which are part of the cult seem to

fit better the private worship than the temple ritual. They involve not only time, but a precise qualification which I doubt very much the temple priests ever cared to obtain; and it is to be feared that, instead of bringing about a real transformation of the worshipper, these *yoga* phases have always been reduced, as is the case to-day, to an external dramatizing of this expected transformation.

- The case of the *yoga* process which accompanies the *āvāhana* (and the opposite rite of *visarjana* as well) is peculiar. Absolutely required for an impermanent image, it appears superfluous for a permanent one, where the presence of Śiva is continuous since the *pratiṣṭhā*; and in that case, it has to be reinterpreted.[24] As we have seen earlier, the difference here is not between *ātmārthapūjā* and *parārthapūjā*, but between the cult on impermanent and permanent images. But could it not be contended that the "normal" support for private cults should be actually an impermanent image, and was so in times of old? Many of the difficulties regarding the *pratiṣṭhā* would be explained away if we could answer positively to this question.
- The *āvaraṇapūjā* itself poses a problem. As one knows, it consists of the worship, around Śiva, generally just before the presentation of the meal (see chart), of one or several circles of divinities[25] who, though commonly interpreted as attendants on the God, seem rather to act mainly as guardians.[26] Now, were this ritual an original part of the temple cult, we would certainly find a correspondance between the list of these divinities and the list of divinities who reside in the temple, round the *garbhagṛha*. It is not the case. On the other hand, the worship of *āvaraṇadevatās* seems to fit the private cult of the *sādhaka* very well, where the required protection is not provided by a permanent structure, either concrete or spiritual; and I would add that it fits especially the rituals on *maṇḍalas*. However, the subject is a complex one, and would demand a more thorough investigation.

2) Another cause of astonishment is the reduplication of the *pūjā* for the officiating priest of a temple, who is supposed to perform first his private worship (at home or in the temple precincts), and afterwards only, the temple cult. This rule is stated in some handbooks and observed nowadays, but it must not be very ancient and I suspect it to betray the ambiguity of the personage called *ācārya* - a point which deserves a separate treatment.

3) The ambiguous figure of the *ācārya*.
We find actually in the Āgamas two quite different accounts of the activities of an *ācārya*. The first one is given by the texts dealing with *ātmārthapūjā*, generally at the end of the chapter on *ācāryābhiṣeka*, when the former *guru*, having anointed his successor, enumerates the duties, or privileges, which will henceforth be his. All these texts agree on three main prerogatives: *dīkṣā*, *pratiṣṭhā*, *vyākhyāna*: the *ācārya* (and he alone) will give initiations to those deserving, perform the installation of Śiva's images for those who ask for it, and comment on the Scriptures (the Āgamas).[27] In this context, the *pratiṣṭhā* concerns the image that the initiates, but above all the *sādhakas*, will personally worship. They may be movable or not,[28] but are certainly not intended for what we call "public" worship. No mention of the latter is ever made: the *ācārya* these texts speak of is obviously the *guru* of a limited community of disciples centered round a *maṭha*, each occupied with his or her own *sādhana*. Often likened to a king, whose majesty and authority he must have had, the *ācārya* is nevertheless above all a highly respectable spiritual and religious teacher, into whom Śiva descends at the time of giving *dīkṣā*.[29] The most essential of his qualities is the true knowledge of Śiva, but all moral virtues are expected of him. Besides, he should be a *mumukṣu*, an aspirant to liberation and only that, and the *dīkṣā* he has received before his *abhiṣeka* must be a *nirvāṇadīkṣā*.[30]

The second kind of information on the activity of an *ācārya* comes from the texts dealing with *parārthapūjā*. It is found either in the chapters which present the Śaivas and their lineage, distributing them in different categories of social import (Ādiśaivas, Anuśaivas, etc.),[31] or at the beginning of the section on *pūjā*,[32] or of the section on *pratiṣṭhā*,[33] or else (rarely) as an appendix or introduction to the chapter on *ācāryābhiṣeka*.[34] In all these instances, the texts are not directly concerned with the *ācārya* as such, their intention being either to eulogize the Ādiśaivas and insist on their privileges, or to state the qualifications of the performer of *parārthapūjā* or *pratiṣṭhā* (in temples), or to distinguish between different kinds of *ācāryas*. The general view, or more exactly the view which has been retained by the temple tradition, is as follows: members of the four *varṇa* may be anointed as *ācāryas* (each being a *guru* for his own class and the classes below), but only those who belong to the class of Ādiśaivas (a kind of super class, as we have seen) may perform *pratiṣṭhās* and *parārthapūjās* in temples. The texts are interested in these duties only, and one gets from these passages the image of an *ācārya* who is mainly a *sthāpaka* (in some texts the two terms are treated as equivalent)[35] and a specialist of ritual. It is difficult to say whether such dispositions are earlier or later than the distinction, within the

group of Śaivāgamas, of a set of 28 works termed "fundamental" (*mūla*), but they correspond probably to a rewriting of the latter, at least of some chapters of them. Curiously, the same texts know also the *ācārya* of the first type (of course, they do not declare, and perhaps are not aware, that he is different from theirs), and they sometimes speak of the *ācārya* (in general) in the language of the Āgamas of the other group.[36] The ritual of *ācāryābhiṣeka* they describe is identical to the one found in those texts; and often they do not hesitate even to reproduce the statement of duties which we have seen. However, they generally avoid the phrase which reveals the fact that each *ācārya* anoints only one disciple, his successor: this rule would not suit the necessities of temple life.

As an intermediate position, we come across, in some of the treatises of this second group, records of the duties of an *ācārya* which are simply extensions of the duties as stated in the first group of texts. Instead of mentioning, besides *dīkṣā* and *vyākhyāna*, the sole *pratiṣṭhā* as a ritual necessarily performed by a *guru*, they cite a number of important rituals, all characteristic of temples, but without mentioning the normal daily *parārthapūjā*. They apparently also forget all that they have declared earlier (evidently in spurious chapters) concerning the Ādiśaivas.

This insufficient (but already too lengthy) information must suffice to show that the image of the *ācārya* is excessively blurred, many successive alterations having left their traces, the last ones never succeeding in effacing completely that which was accepted earlier. The line of evolution is regular, from the head of a *maṭha*, responsible for a small party of disciples, to the chief priest of a temple; from undisputed, but geographically and socially limited authority, to a high public function, so much coveted that the access to it is progressively refused to an ever greater part of the population and that the function tends to become hereditary.

At the same time, we note that the meanings of the terms *ātmārtha* and *parārthapūjā* are altered, since we can read for instance that it is bad to practise *ātmārtha* for a salary,[37] a statement which can only be understood by taking *ātmārtha* (or *svārtha*) in the sense of "for one person only", and conversely *parārtha* in the sense of "for the country at large".

Coming back to point number two: it is to the *guru* of old that the texts impose, as daily programme: *pūjā*, *dhyāna*, *japa*, *yoga* - as much as his other duties permit - for he was not a temple priest.[38] This very programme seems to have been extended to the *ācārya* who is mainly a *pūjaka* and who is therefore requested to worship Śiva in two ways: for himself and for the country. Such an injunction would be meaningful if this *ācārya* had something definite to expect from Śiva; but he is a

mumukṣu (at least theoretically), whose private cult is not supposed to bear any fruit. What is then the significance of his *ātmārthapūjā*?

From all these anomalies concerning the *ācārya*, I shall of course not conclude that temple cult has developed later than private cult, but only that the ritual preparation and theoretical qualifications of the officiating priests of a temple have been largely borrowed from the texts which know the *ācārya* solely as a spiritual and religious master. Assuredly there was a time when the priest of a temple was not obliged to receive the same *abhiṣeka* as the one given to the *guru* of a *maṭha*, and still less the *nirvāṇa-dīkṣā* which necessarily precedes it (and has no meaning for persons who will never boast of being *mumukṣus*).

VI. Some hypotheses on the historical relation between private and temple cults.

The preceding remarks - to which others could easily be added - impose the idea of a reciprocal influence between private worship and temple cults, which implies naturally the prior separate existence of two forms of cults. I shall call them "old private" and "old public" cults.

Now the Āgamas, even the oldest among them, describe a situation when this influence has already come into play and resulted in the common model of *śivapūjā* we have started with. They know only this model and they present it as eternal and immutable; and it is only after a close enquiry that they have been compelled to admit that their model has not after all been immune from changes and is perhaps not so old as contended. A survey of the texts reveals other ill-effaced traces of old techniques. Not only do we come across some private cults deprived of the (to my eyes) useless phases, but also, which is more important, of temple cults without *yoga*, etc. These latter concern mainly secondary divinities, but I have some reasons to think that, far from being simplifications of the cult of Śiva as we know it, they bear witness of antiquated forms of this cult, whose structure they have simply preserved.[39]

From these feeble traces, and from the conclusions to which I have been led by what I have termed "anomalies", is it possible to try to picture to ourselves the starting point and the evolution of private cult on the one hand, of public cult on the other?

Let us go back in our imagination some centuries before the putting into writing to the Śaivāgamas, and observe the Śiva worshippers, and other worshippers as well. The hypotheses I deem to be the most reasonable concerning their activities would be the following ones:

On one side, we would come across private worshippers - the ancestors of our *sādhakas* - performing some kind of cult in view of mastering of, or identification with, a given God or Goddess whose special powers

they wish to gain. From observations in parallel Indian domains, one may assume that their practice was initiated by a *dīkṣā*, most probably combined with an aspersion (*abhiṣeka*), and certainly much simpler than the highly complex *dīkṣā* our texts now prescribe as a precondition to the *abhiṣeka*. *Dhyāna* must have been an essential feature of the cult, resulting in a positive visualization of the divinity, who had to be seen and felt as really present, perhaps as possessing the devotee. These cults were combined with long *japas*; and it is probably in this milieu that the *yoga* made its way into the *pūjā* and conquered the place it now has. They were accordingly a meeting point between several ways, at first independent: adoration, possession, use of *mantras*, *yoga*. I would think that the offerings were nil or few - a situation which is testified by some old texts[40] and which seems to have continued in Bali, where the Śaiva worshipper appears to be content to have the God present, praise him, and prepare, with his help, purifying water.[41] These private worshippers probably practised their cults in accordance with rules handed down orally from master to pupil. Hence initiatory lines going back to an unknown past and whose diversity was bound to increase on account of dissensions between disciples of the same master on this or that ground. The techniques and *mantras* of one line differed most certainly on details only from those of the next line, but these details were deemed important enough to be kept secret from any person not pertaining to one's branch - a disposition which has been retained in the Āgamas. Adepts of one line would form a kind of family, and it is but normal that they came to group themselves, especially during periods of unrest, in order to insure the protection of persons and of traditional knowledge. And here is the kernel of what was later to be called *maṭha*.

On the other side, we have probably to imagine an "old public worship" of the simplest kind: offerings (of flowers, cereals, etc., but above all of animal victims) made by a group of persons pertaining to the same village or the same quarter of the town, to a divinity whose wrath they feared and whose protection they were looking for. Most probably a rough image would represent this God or Goddess: a stick, a stone, a trident, etc., installed either in the open (hence my avoidance, at this stage, of the expression "temple cult") or under a primitive shelter, which was later, and in some cases only, to develop into a temple. The practitioners would probably come from any caste and were more akin to the present-day village *pūjāris* than to the highly considered *ācāryas* whom the Āgamas speak of. No *dīkṣā* was necessary for them and the rules they had to observe were few. I cannot err much if I add that these cults were mixed with a lot of magical practices. It is not necessary to assume that Śiva was prominent among the divinities worshipped this way; it is

enough if we accept that he later replaced several of them, henceforward considered as his aspects, and that his cult inherited much from these village cults. Among the traces of such primitive ceremonies which have been preserved in the āgamic cult, I would mention the most colourful phases of the *pūjā*, to wit, the *upacāras* which are offered to Śiva conceived as a Sovereign (dressing, garlanding, feeding, etc.); the *balis*, some of them still of animal origin, which are offered by the temple priest to the host of generally dreadful divinities who inhabit the temple precincts; the *nityotsava*, usually connected with these *balis*; the music and the dances - not to speak of the numerous festivals which take place during the year. If I am correct in thinking that the temple is partly (for we must not forget the caves) the result of the development of the rough shelters of village divinities, then we must ascribe to the same origin all the parts of the cult which take into account a concrete structure: the cult of Kṣetrapāla (of which I have not spoken), the cult of the door, etc.

I am fully aware of the fragility of these hypotheses. It would be unwise indeed to try and add precisions, and answer all the questions which pose themselves urgently from the point we have reached. I shall content myself with mentioning a few of them, deliberately omitting those which touch on iconography or architecture.

1. How did the informal grouping of *sādhakas* of a given line come to be structured into a *maṭha*, with different categories of initiates and an *ācārya* at the head?

2. Was each of the *śaivamaṭhas* the birth-place of one Śaivāgama? We may understand that, at a certain stage of the development of an initiatory line, it was felt necessary for the master then in charge to set down in writing the ritual and *yoga* techniques, as well as the rules of discipline, which were peculiar to his branch, adding eventually the philosophical conclusions which were arrived at following continuous reflection on the ritual. This would account, on the one hand for the stress on individual practice which seems to characterize the older texts, on the other hand for the diversity of opinions found in Āgamas. Since however there is a definite kinship between these texts, even amounting to close similarity for some of them, we have to assume early regular communication between the different groups, not to speak of a later rewriting and deliberate homogenizing, which fortunately left some texts practically untouched. How was all this achieved?

3. Now - and this is essential for the problem I am dealing with - there must also have been contacts between the *maṭhas* and the village worshippers of such or such divinity. Of which kind could they have

been? One may imagine that at one time, and probably with the help of the prince, the *maṭhas* extended their authority over the villages around, and were instrumental in shaping for them a new religious life, purer (see the term Śuddhaśaiva that the Siddhāntin use sometimes to designate themselves) and more organized.[42] Is it then that proper temples appeared? And did the *gurus* of the *maṭhas* come to take charge of the ceremonies therein? This would explain the apparition of a new type of *ācārya*.

4. Finally, how and when did the features which are definitely of Vedic origin (especially the *homa*, but also the *arghya* and other items) enter the Śaiva cults? The only sure fact is that their importance has regularly increased since the time the Āgamas were put into writing - the most ancient treatises ignoring them almost totally, the most recent padding their *pūjās* with Vedic *mantras* and insisting on the compatibility of the two traditions.

I have posed these questions because they present themselves naturally to the mind. There are many others, especially about the connection between Pāśupatas and āgamic Śaivas, and Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism. The main point in my paper is, however, my contention that the cult of Śiva as we know it from Śaiva scriptures is the result of the combination of (at least) two quite different styles of worship. It goes without saying that such a conclusion needs to be supported by more facts, drawn from other texts and from other sectors of Indian culture (epigraphy, iconography, etc.). I shall therefore welcome all kinds of reactions, above all negative ones (if assorted with arguments), which would compel me either to clarify and strengthen my position, or to abandon it if better hypotheses are put forward.

Notes

1. Abbreviations and bibliographical data of the texts quoted:

a) Āgamas critically edited by N.R. Bhatt and published by the French Institute of Indology, Pondicherry:

Aj	= *Ajitāgama*, 2 vol., 1964, 1967;
MatP	= *Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama*, with comm., 2 vol., 1977 (*vp*), 1982 (*kp, yp, cp*);
Mṛg	= *Mṛgendrāgama*, *kp* and *cp*, with comm., 1962;
Mṛg (transl)	= French transl. of the preceding, by H. Brunner-Lachaux, 1985;
Rau	= *Rauravāgama*, 2 vol., 1961, 1972;
SārK	= *Sārdhatriśatikālottarāgama*, with comm., 1979.

b) Other Āgamas and Tantras:

(P)Kām	= *Kāmikāgama, pūrvabhāga*, Madras 1975;
(U)Kām	= *Kāmikāgama, uttarabhāga*, Madras 1900, *grantha* script;
Kir	= *Kiraṇāgama*, Devakoṭṭai 1932, *gr.*;
Mak	= *Makuṭāgama*, Madras 1977, *gr.*;
PKār	= *Pūrvakāraṇāgama*, Madras 1922, *gr.*;
UKār	= *Uttarakāraṇāgama*, Madras 1928, *gr.*;
Su	= *Suprabhedāgama*, Madras 1929, *gr.*;
SvT	= *Svacchandatantra*, KSTS, 1921-1943, 7 vol.;
NT	= *Netratantra*, KSTS, 2 vol., 1926, 1939.

c) Handbooks:

ĪśgP	= *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati*, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, 4 vol., 1920-1925;
SP1, SP2, SP3	= *Somaśambhupaddhati*, Texte, Traduction et Notes par H. Brunner-Lachaux, Publ. IFI, 3 vol., 1963, 1968, 1977.

d) Other abbreviations:

cp, kp, vp, yp	= *caryā-, kriyā-, vidyā-, yoga-pāda* (of the Āgamas);
JA	= Journal Asiatique;
KSTS	= Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies.

NB: Except *Mak*, all the Indian editions in *grantha* script under (b) are out of print, available in libraries only.

2. Among the texts quoted: *MatP, Mṛg, SārK, SvT* belong to the first group; *Aj, Kām, Kār, Kir, Rau, Su* belong to the second.

3. List of Āgamas and Upāgamas in *Rau*, vol. I, chart facing p. xviii (this list is from *PKām*, ch.1.).

4. (a) *yajanaṃ svārtham ākhyātaṃ svasyeṣṭaphaladaṃ yataḥ* (*PKām*, 4, 2b);
(b) *tat parārtham iti proktaṃ anyeṣāṃ phaladānataḥ* (*Aj, kp*, 20. 7b).

5. *athārcanavidhiṃ vakṣye bhukti-mukti-phala-pradam /*
parārthaṃ svārtham ity evaṃ dvividhaṃ tat prakīrtitam //
dīkṣānte guruṇā datte liṅge vā sthaṇḍilādike /
yajanaṃ svārtham ākhyātaṃ svasyeṣṭaphaladaṃ yataḥ //
grāma-kheṭa-purādau vā nadyāṃ parvata eva vā /
aṣṭaṣaṣṭi-mahākṣetreṣv-anyatra ca manorame //
svayambhu-deva-bāṇārṣa-liṅga-yukte śivālaye /
manujaiḥ sthāpite liṅge parārtha-yajanaṃ smṛtam //
PKām, 4, 1-4

ātmārthaṃ ca parārthaṃ ca pūjā dvividham ucyate /
datte ca guruṇā liṅge sthaṇḍile svayam ātmani //
ātmārtham idam ākhyātaṃ parārthaṃ tu tataḥ śṛṇu /
grāmādau sthāpite liṅge yadvā devādi-nirmite //
parārtham iti vijñeyaṃ sarvaprāṇi-hitāvaham /
Āgamarahasya, quoted in *Arcanaprakāśa*, Bangalore 1962, p.140.

kṣaṇike calaliṅge ca sthaṇḍile maṇḍale'pi ca /
kautuke bhitticitre vā ātmārth(ā)rcanam ārabhet //
grām(ādiṣv)athavānyeṣu śivadhāmani nirmite /
teṣu sthāvaraliṅgeṣu parārtha-yajana(ṃ) smṛtam //
Su, kp, 8, 3-4 (slightly amended). See also *Aj, kp,* 20, 1-7.

6. The term *sādhaka* is taken throughout this paper in this technical sense. The person so named is second in rank in the hierarchy of initiates: *ācārya, sādhaka, putraka, samayin*. Cf. H. Brunner, "Le *sādhaka*, personnage oublié du śivaïsme du Sud", *JA* 1975, p.439*sq*; *SP3*, Intr. p. xlv-xlvi and p.416-424, n.457.

7. See *Mṛg, cp,* 1, 96b-98a and App.I (Bhatt) - our translation p.393, n.3 and App. III; *MatP, kp*, 12.

8. *Mṛg, kp,* 3; *MatP, kp,* 3; *SvT*, 2.

9. *PKām*, ch.4; *Aj, kp,* 20.

10. *yajanaṃ dvividhaṃ proktaṃ ātmārthaṃ ca parārthakam /*
ātmārthaṃ calam ityuktaṃ parārthaṃ sthiraliṅgakam //
PKār, 49, 20b-21a

See also the texts quoted in n.5.

11. See *Aj, kp,* 20, 2b-4a and texts quoted in n.5.

12. Opinions in this respect differ greatly. For instance, while all texts accept metal for movable *liṅgas*, it is either refused (majority of texts) or accepted (*Aj, kp,* 4, 11-17) for immovable ones. And so on.

13. See *SP1*, p.190, n.2 and p.274, n.2.

14. *sarvaprāṇi-hitāvaham* (second passage quoted n.5).

15. See *SP3*, ch.1 to 5.

16. *vipra-kṣatriya-viṭ-śūdrā dīkṣitāś ca praveśakāḥ /*
ātmārtha-yajanaṃ kuryur na kuryus te parārthakam //
ūrdhvaśaivais tu kartavyam ātmārthaṃ ca parārthakam /
ūrdhvaśaiva iti proktas sa śivabrāhmaṇo guruḥ //
Mak, 2, 6-7
PKār, 30, 17-18 (with a few mistakes, and *ādiśaiva* instead of *ūrdhvaśaiva*)

See also the texts quoted in *Aj*, vol. I, p.197, n.4.

17. See text quoted n.16. Also: H. Brunner, "Les catégories sociales védiques dans le śivaïsme du Sud", *JA* 1964 [p.451-472], p.453-57.

18. See for instance *SP1*, p.132, *śl.*32-33; *Aj, kp,* 20, 108b-109; *MatP, kp,* 3, 35. Note that this last text does not enjoin any *dvārapūjā*.

19. *SP1*, p.266-68.

20. As in the case of *vāstupūjā*, when the Deities of the Site (*vāstudevatā*) are served on a *maṇḍala* called *vāstumaṇḍala*. See for instance Stella Kramrisch, *The Hindu Temple*, p.32 and 86-88.

21. See *SP1*, p.278*sq*.; *SP2,* p.266-288 - in particular p.282, *śl.*69, which is identical with *PKām*, 8, 124 (while most of the other *ślokas* in this passage are found in *UKām*, ch.30.).

22. For instance in *Aj, kp,* 20, 272-76. The list of rites to be omitted in case of *ātmārthapūjā*, according to this text, is actually longer: *dvārapūjā, caṇḍeśanivedana, āmantraṇahavis, nityotsava* (comprises *balis*), *mahāghaṇṭā, tiraskariṇīkriyā* and *śuddhanṛtta*. But the third and the last three items are not parts of the *pūjā* which we have taken as our model; they are added to the list of *upacāras* in the best types of *pūjās* only.

Su (*kp*, 8, 13, quoted in *Aj*, vol. I, p.236, n.7) cuts out only *nityotsava* and *pādukārcana* (a rite described in *Aj, kp,* 20, 253-260).

23. See *SP1*, p.218-223. Same verses in *PKām*, 4, 512-514; *Aj, kp,* 20, 241b-244a.

24. See above, n.13.

25. *SP1*, p.208, n.1 and App. VIII, p.333. For a general survey of *āvaraṇapūjā*, see *SārK*, Intr., p.xv-xix.

26. It is obvious for the last two circles (Lokapālas and their Weapons), but most certainly true of the others also.

27. *SP3*, p.486 and 496; *Mṛg, kp,* 8, 214b-216. Some texts do not even mention *pratiṣṭhā*: *MatP, kp,* 9, 56; *SvT*, 4, 472.

28. See texts cited n.7.

29. See *SP3*, p.6, *śl.*7 and p.414, *śl.*242; *SvT*, 4, 411b.

30. It is always understood that the *ācārya* should be a *mumukṣu*, as well as the *putrakas* (= *nirvāṇadīkṣitas*) among whom he is chosen. See for instance *SvT*, 4, 79b, comm., or 481b, intr.; *NT*, 4, 1a, comm.; and our remarks in *SP3*, p.470, end of n.20. However, the Āgamas dealing with *parārthapūjās* rarely insist on this evidence.

31. It is the case with *Su, cp,* 1, 25-27 and 69-70 (text terribly corrupted).

32. For instance in *Aj, kp,* 20, 8-9 (the text is perhaps corrupted); *PKām,* 4, 5-8 quoted n.4 *ad loc.*; *PKār*, 30, 17-18, quoted n.16 *ad loc.*

33. For instance *PKār*, 26, 12b-14 (quoted in the article mentioned n.17: p.468, n.14).

34. For instance *UKām*, 24, 5-10 (the subject is *ācāryaḥ*):

ādiśaive kule jātaḥ śreṣṭhas syāt sthāpanādiṣu /
viprādayaś caturvarṇā api yogyā svakarmaṇi //
dīkṣāyāṃ sarvamartyānāṃ pratiṣṭhāyām athotsave /
snapane prokṣaṇe 'nyatra prāyaścitte 'bhiṣecane //
vyākhyānādau ca śastas syāt svārthe vātha parārthake /
sarvadevārcane viprās tv ādiśaivo gurūttamaḥ //
viprādayas trayo varṇā dīkṣāyāṃ sthāpane'pi ca /
brāhmaṇaḥ kṣatriyādīnāṃ kṣatriyaś śūdra-vaiśyayoḥ //
vaiśyaś śūdrasya dīkṣāyāṃ svasya jātāv apīṣyate /
svārtheṣṭau calaliṅgasya pratiṣṭhāyāṃs trayas tv ime //
śūdro'pi śūdradīkṣāyāṃ svārthe ca calasañjake /
bāṇaliṅge kṣaṇe vāpi sthāpako yadi naiṣṭhikaḥ //

(*viprāḥ* in line 6 is a vocative).

35. See *Su, kp,* 21: the person described by *śl.* 3-9 is called *ācārya* in *śl.*2b and 14b, but *sthāpaka* in *śl.* 10b. The two words are interchangeable.

36. It is the case with *Su, cp,* 4, 58b-59a:

śivārcanāgnikāryaṃ ca japa-dhyānaṃ ca śaktitaḥ /
vyākhyām anugrahaṃ kāryam evaṃ bhavatu sarvadā //

(note that *anugraha* means *dīkṣā*)
Also: *PKār*, 26, 37-39 (text corrupted); *ĪśgP*, vol. III, p.196, *śl.* 67-69.

37. See *PKār*, 49, 39:

ātmārthe vā parārthe vā yajanārthaṃ bhṛtiṃ grahet /
sa vai devalako nāma /

38. See *Mṛg, kp,* 8, 217-18; *SP3*, p.496, *śl.* 26b-27.

39. Even with respect to Śiva, some texts have descriptions of his cult or installation which do not seem to involve much *yoga*: see *Rau, kp,* ch.10 or 28.

40. E.g. *Vīṇāśikhatantra*, ed. by T. Goudriaan, Motilal Banarsidas 1985. See for instance the chapter called (by the editor) "The worship of the Five Deities" (*śl.* 94-118).

41. See C. Hooykaas, *Surya-Sevana*, Amsterdam 1966, Intr. p.35-41 (it is the summary of the cult of Śiva in the form of Sūrya) and our review of this work: "A propos d'un rituel balinais", *JA* 1967, [p.409-422], p.412.

42. One may evoke here the case of the present-day *maṭhas* belonging to Vīraśaivas. Each of them is connected with a number of towns and villages, which recognize the authority and welcome the intervention of the head (usually called Jagadguru) in religious, moral, legal, educational and, more generally, social matters.

Sectarian divisions according to Vaikhānasāgama

by Gérard Colas

§1. I propose to present several classifications of sects as found in Vaikhānasāgama.[1] To respect the time-schedule, I shall discuss neither the term "sect" nor what concerns the non-Vaiṣṇava traditions.[2] Moreover I will not enter into the details of the four Vaikhānasa lineages of Kāśyapa (alleged author of a *Jñānakāṇḍa* [= *JK*]),[3] Atri (alleged author of *Samūrtārcanādhikaraṇa* [= *SA*], also entitled *Atrisaṃhitā*), Marīci (*Ānandasaṃhitā* [= *ĀS*], *Vimānārcanākalpa* [= *VK*][4] also known as *Marīcisaṃhitā*) and Bhṛgu (*Prakīrṇādhikāra* [= *PA*], *Yajñādhikāra* [= *YA*], *Kriyādhikāra* [= *KrA*], *Khilādhikāra* [= *KhA*]).

§2. The texts of the Vaikhānasāgama often divide what they call the *vaiṣṇava-tantra*,[5] or *-śāstra* (*PA* 30, 5-10), or *-vidhi* (*SA* 80, 10 and sqq.) into two traditions: Vaikhānasa and Pāñcarātra. While the Vaikhānasa *saṃhitā*-s naturally praise the Vaikhānasāgama, they also consider the Vaikhānasa and Pāñcarātra traditions as complementary. The Vaikhānasa *tantra* is often said to be principal (*mukhya*), while the Pāñcarātra is termed as secondary or complementary (*gauṇa*).[6] *SA* (65, 114b - 118) says that the Vaikhānasa-śāstra is the *śrī-śāstra* and that Viṣṇu established the Pāñcarātra-śāstra to protect it.

The Vaikhānasa *tantra* is said to be *vaidika* and of *saumya* quality.[7] According to *SA* 65, 118, it gives release (*mukti*), but other texts declare that it brings both *mukti* and *bhukti*[8] and yet others that it bears fruits in this world and in the other.[9] Those who practise the Vaikhānasa cult are *dvija* (*PA* 30, 6a)[10] born in a Vaikhānasa family, who have undergone the *saṃskāra*-s prescribed by the Vaikhānasasūtra (*YA* 51, 3a; *SA* 65, 122b-123; *KhA* 41, 6-7). The Vaikhānasa cult with *mantra*-s taken from the "four Veda-s" (*SA* 78, 3a) has to be practised in villages and towns, in temples, but also in royal palaces,[11] in houses (*JK* 108, p.199), and especially in the houses of Brahmins (*VK* 73, p.458; *PA* 30, 9a). According to *KhA* 41, 2 and sqq, it is associated with a specific iconography of Viṣṇu.

The Pāñcarātra tradition is qualified as *tāntrika*.[12] It is said to be *avaidika* (*VK* 73, p.457; *PA* 30, 5-10). The Pāñcarātra cult uses *mantra*-s based on the *Ekāyana* (*SA* 78, 4b). According to several texts[13] it gives fruits only in the other world. It is also said to be *āgneya*:[14] *SA* (78, 7b) explains that this appellation is due to the fact that it brings release only (see also *KhA* 41, 2bis and 6). *JK* (108, p.199) and *PA* (30, 8a) state that it does not bring prosperity in this world, and *SA* (78, 10b), that it

is esteemed by hermits (*vanastha*) and ascetics (*yatin*). Thus it is meant for *mumukṣu*-s and must be performed in their *āśrama*-s (*SA* 78, 10a; see also *ibid.* 10b; *KhA* 41, 5b). While the Vaikhānasa cult is citadine, the Pāñcarātra is prescribed for far away places, outside towns, on a hill or a mountain, near a river or an ocean, in forests,[15] and not in the house of a *vipra* (*PA* 30, 10b). The *SA* (80, 21-23) and *KhA* (41, 2 and sqq) evoke briefly representations of Viṣṇu which would be specific to the Pāñcarātra tradition and which would bear a club (*gadā*) in their left hand.

Thus the two-fold division of the Vaiṣṇava tradition is usually uniformly described and well contrasted in the Vaikhānasa texts, but when we enter into the details of the definition of the Pāñcarātra followers, we remark different kinds of approach.

§3. The most generally accepted condition to be accepted as Pāñcarātra is the undergoing of the initiation (*dīkṣā*) which consists in the Vaiṣṇava *pañca-saṃskāra*-s: *tāpa* (branding with a hot iron *cakra*), the *ūrdhvapuṇḍra* (*vaiṣṇava* mark), the *nāma* (attribution of a ritual name), the *mantra* (communication of a *mantra*), the *yāga* (or *arcanā*, cult).[16] According to *VK* 73 (p.457) the Pāñcarātra cult must be performed by people who have undergone an initiation (see also *KrA* 27, 81b), which the *PA* (30, 7b) says to consist in the *pañcasaṃskāra*-s. The *KhA* (41, 9a) adds that the Pāñcarātra followers must be twice-born and that there is no condition relating to the *śākhā* or the *sūtra* which is followed. But *ĀS* (14, 31-33a) stipulates that the condition to belong to the *tāntrika* Pāñcarātra tradition is not only the undergoing of a *dīkṣā*, but also the adherence to the Kātyāyanasūtra. The same text adds that those who follow neither the Vaikhānasasūtra nor the Kātyāyanasūtra are neither *vaidika* nor *tāntrika* and are rejected from the "*Bhagavacchāstra*". Thus there is no general agreement in the Vaikhānasāgama about the nature of the qualification (*adhikāra*) to Pāñcarātra.

§4. Within the two-fold classification into Vaikhānasa and Pāñcarātra, the Pāñcarātra tradition itself may also be divided into two sub-groups: either *āgneya* and *tāmasa*, or *miśra* and *bhāgavata*. Apart from the Vaikhānasa-s (who are called *paramasāttvika*-s), the *SA* 65 (123-125) distinguishes the *āgneya-vaiṣṇava*-s and the *tāmasa-vaiṣṇava*-s of the Pāñcarātra: the former are branded with a *cakra* according to the Pāñcarātra method and follow the rites (*kriyā*) prescribed by the *sūtra* of Bodhāyana and others, while the latter are those of the Kātyāyana and other *sūtra*-s "who undergo and practise *śrauta* and *smārta* rites which are not mentioned by the Vaikhānasasūtra".[17] We do not know which series of rites are meant

by *bodhāyanādi* and *kātyāyanādi*, but this passage of *SA* may be compared with *ĀS* 14, 31-33a (see §3 *supra*).

The *KrA* (27, 82 and sqq) divide the Pāñcarātra, and the *YA* (51, 1 and sqq), the *tāntrika* tradition into two: the *miśra* sub-group and the *bhāgavata* (or *śuddha*) sub-group. The *miśra* sub-group is also called Pāñcarātra proper. Its members are said to be "*viprādi*"; being initiated, they have abandoned their own *sūtra*: can this be the reason why they are called *miśra*, or is it because this class gathers people who are originally from different *sūtra*-s? According to *YA* 51 (7b) the *miśra* path brings only release whereas the Vaikhānasa *vaidika tantra* brings *bhukti* and *mukti* (51, 8a).

The *bhāgavata* (or *śuddha*) sub-group has no *vedamaryādā* (*YA* 51, 6a). This path brings *bhukti* only (*YA* 51, 7b). There are two categories of *bhāgavata*-s: the *sūta*-s and the *sāttvata*-s; they practise the "bodily *saṃskāra*-s" (*śārīrasaṃskāra*) according to their *tantra* (*YA* 51, 5). One may wonder who are these *sūta*-s and these *sāttvata*-s. According to *Viśvāmitrasaṃhitā*,[18] a Pāñcarātra text, a *sūta* is a kind of hermit (*vānaprastha*) who offers worship according to a tradition (*āgama*) which has been taught especially for *pratiloma*-s; the *Sanatkumārasaṃhitā*[19] (Brahmarātra V, 3a) stipulates that they are the only category of *pratiloma* fit for the Pāñcarātra initiation. The term *sāttvata* is often taken to mean Pāñcarātra (see Varadachari, p.159), but here it is more particularly associated with the *bhāgavata* sub-group; *sāttvata* may also refer to a "mixed caste". Thus the subdivision of the Pāñcarātra into *miśra* and *bhāgavata* seems not based on the adherence to a *sūtra*, but on the caste.

§5. Two other classifications of Vaiṣṇava-s are found in *ĀS*. The first corresponds, broadly speaking, to a division into Vaikhānasa, Pāñcarātra and Bhāgavata; the second introduces the notion of a *dīkṣā* provided by Vaikhānasa-s themselves and is more elaborated.[20]

The *ĀS* (8, 14-19 and 17, 16-19) evokes a four-fold division of Vaiṣṇava-s: *anādivaiṣṇava*-s, *ādivaiṣṇava*-s, *avāntaravaiṣṇava*-s and *bhāgavata*-s, out of which the first category refers to divine beings like Acyuta (*ibid.* 8, 15b-16). The *ādivaiṣṇava*-s are the Vaikhānasa-s who have undergone the *saṃskāra*-s prescribed by their Vaikhānasasūtra (*ibid.* 8, 17a). Their *siddhānta* (or *mata*, *śāstra*) is called *vaidika* and their *āgama* is named *nigama* (*ibid.* 8, 19 and 23b). They undergo a "ceremony" in the womb of their mothers who, in the eighth month of her pregnancy, eat a cake printed with a *cakra*.[21] This explains why the born Vaikhānasa-s do not have to be initiated by the *pañcasaṃskāra*-s during their life-time: this ceremony is even prohibited to them (*ĀS* 4, 60-61; see also *KrA* 36, 51-54).

The *avāntaravaiṣṇava*-s are those who have undergone the *pañcasaṃs-kāra*-s, as well as the sacraments prescribed by *sūtra*-s other than Vaikhānasa, and are the followers of the Pāñcarātra.[22] Their *siddhānta* is *tāntrika* (*ibid.* 8, 21b) and their *āgama* is also called *tāntrika*. In fact the *siddhānta* of these *avāntaravaiṣṇava*-s is said to be four-fold (*ibid.* 8, 23-24); the text itself does not specify which are these four subdivisions, but the Sanskrit commentary (p.111) enumerates them as: *āgama, mantra, tantra* and *tantrāntara*. Several Pāñcarātra *saṃhitā*-s (*Pādmasaṃhitā*, Caryāpāda 19 and 21; *Īśvarasaṃhitā* 21;[23] *Pārameśvarasaṃhitā*;[24] *Pauṣ-karasaṃhitā*)[25] present the same four *siddhānta*-s. The initiation of the *avāntaravaiṣṇava*-s is called the *taptacakrāṅkaṇa* (*ĀS* 8, 29a; 8, 33b) which is the *tāpa*, one of the *pañcasaṃskāra*-s referred to earlier (see §3 beginning, *supra*).

The last category of *vaiṣṇava*-s is that of the *bhāgavata*-s who are *muṇḍamudrādhara* (*ibid.* 8, 18b): they have shaven heads and they wear a *mudrā*; the Sanskrit commentary (p.111) interprets this term as signifying "mark of branded *mudrā*", i.e. branded *cakra*,[26] but according to the text itself the only initiation they require is the *nyāsa-cakra*, that is simply the drawing of *cakra* and *śaṅkha* with sandal paste on their arms.[27] The *siddhānta* of the Bhāgavata-s is called *bhākta* and their *āgama* is said to be *miśra* (*ibid.* 8, 21a and 23b): one may wonder whether this last apella-tion is due to the fact that they do not have their own scriptures or that they use the scriptures of others.

The same text, in its chapter 9 (1b) proposes a second three-fold division of Vaiṣṇava-s which is more elaborate than the first. The three kinds of Vaiṣṇava-s are the *saumya*-, the *miśra*- and the *śuddha-vaiṣ-ṇava*-s.

The *saumya-vaiṣṇava*-s are those who are born Vaikhānasa-s and have undergone the *saṃskāra*-s prescribed by the Vaikhānasasūtra and its tradition. They are also called *śuddha-vaikhānasa*-s (*ibid.* 9, 1a and 9, 2) or even *saumya-vaikhānasa*-s (*ibid.* 9, 8b).

The *miśra-vaiṣṇava*-s are *dīkṣita*-s: they have undergone the *pañ-casaṃskāra*-s, including the branding with the heated iron *cakra*. It is interesting to note that there are two kinds of *miśra-vaiṣṇava*-s: those initiated according to *āgama* (*āgamadīkṣita*), i.e. by Pāñcarātra-s, and those initiated according to *nigama* (*nigamadīkṣita*), that is by Vaikhāna-sa-s (*ibid.* 9, 4b and 5). In its chapters 11 and 12 the *ĀS* relates the *pañcasaṃskāra*-s and particularly the *taptacakrāṅkaṇa*, which are provided by Vaikhānasa-s to initiate non-Vaikhānasa-s. The text adapts a famous image: "as the butterfly transforms the worm into a butterfly, in the same way the Vaikhānasa gives a non-Vaikhānasa the shape of a Vaikhā-nasa by the *aṅkaṇa* (branding)" (*ibid.* 8, 7). Vaikhānasa-s can provide this

initiation not only to non-Vaikhānasa twice-borns, but also to *śūdra*-s and to those of a "mixed caste" (*saṅkaraja*) (*ibid.* 8, 8; 11, 27b-31). The *nigamadīkṣita*-s are also called *miśra-vaikhānasa*-s by contrast with the *śuddha-vaikhānasa*-s or born Vaikhānasa-s (*ibid.* 9, 1). The *SA* (78, 16; 78, 34) also speaks of those initiated in the *nigamādhvan* (*nigamādhvanā* or *nigamādhvani dīkṣitāḥ*) who can be employed as cooks (*pācaka*) and ritual assistants (*paricāra*) in temples (see also *ĀS* 13, 39).

The third category in this classification is that of the *śuddha-vaiṣṇava*-s (to be clearly distinguished from the *śuddha-vaikhānasa*-s, also named *saumya-vaiṣṇava*-s). These *śuddha-vaiṣṇava*-s are called *smārta-vaikhānasa*-s (*ĀS* 9, 1b; 11, 4-5). All those who enter the third stage of life, the *vānaprasthāśrama*, must *de facto* be considered as *smārta-vaikhānasa*-s (*ibid.* 9, 8a). However, if they are not born Vaikhānasa-s, they must undergo the *nyāsa-cakra* ceremony (*ibid.* 11, 5).[28] Can it be presumed that the *śuddha-vaiṣṇava*-s are the same as the *bhāgavata*-s of the division presented by *ĀS* which we have exposed previously? This is supported by the fact that both *bhāgavata*-s and *śuddha-vaiṣṇava*-s are bound to undergo the *nyāsa-cakra* ceremony; the *bhāgavata*-s were head-shaven, a sign which reminds of the state of renouncer, and the *śuddha-vaiṣṇava*-s are hermits, the state of hermit being quite comparable to that of renouncer.[29] One may recall, too, that *sūta*-s are a category of *bhāgavata* in *YA* and that *sūta*-s form a variety of *vānaprastha* according to Pāñcarātra sources (see §4 *supra*).

Thus the *ĀS* contains a rather simple three-fold division of Vaiṣṇava-s into Vaikhānasa, Pāñcarātra and Bhāgavata, as well as a more complex classification which distinguishes: the Vaikhānasa-s properly speaking, the group of those who have undergone a *dīkṣā* from the hands of the Vaikhānasa-s, the Pāñcarātra-s (and their initiates), and the *śuddhavaiṣṇava*-s.

§6. We must also mention a division of the *vaiṣṇava* cult into three which seems, at least partly, linked with a classification of sects. It is found in the *KhA* (36, 2-27) which explains that the cult to Viṣṇu may be Vaikhānasa, Pāñcarātra or *āgneya*. This classification is based on a mythological narration. Without entering into details, one may summarize the passage. At the beginning of the world there was a cult "with *mantra*-s from the Veda", which is termed "*vaikhānasa*" (*ibid.* 36, 26b-27a). Then the Veda-s were stolen twice by Asura-s and twice Viṣṇu ordained a substitute and temporary cult before recovering the Veda-s successively as Matsya and Varāha. The first substitute consists in the "cult by name" (*nāmārcana*) with the twelve-syllabled and eight-syllabled *mantra*-s and is called Pāñcarātra (*ibid.* 36, 13-14). The second substitute cult is practised

"without *mantra*" (it is an *amantrārcana*) "according to the method prescribed in the *tantra*" (*tantra-proktena vidhinā*) (*ibid.* 36, 22-23).

§7. We come now to some problems. There has been, at the age of *ĀS* and *SA*, an initiation provided by Vaikhānasa-s to non-Vaikhānasa-s, who hereafter were called *nigamadīkṣita*-s. This initiation consisted in the *pañcasaṃskāra*-s. As we do not find mention of this initiation in (most probably) relatively ancient Vaikhānasa texts like *Vimānārcanākalpa* and others, we may infer that the introduction of this custom in the Vaikhānasa tradition is relatively recent and may have been limited in time and space.

One may wonder about the reason of the insertion of this device in Vaikhānasāgama. According to the texts (*SA* 78, 15b-16; *ĀS* 13, 39), the employment of *nigamadīkṣita*-s in the functions of temple-cook and assistant is only a palliative in case of the absence of born Vaikhānasa-s to fill these functions (one may imagine several causes for the lack of born Vaikhānasa-s).[30] Though *SA* accepts the *nigamadīkṣita*-s as well as those initiated in Pāñcarātra (*ibid.* 78, 35) to serve in *vaiṣṇava* temples, the *ĀS* (13, 39-40) speaks only of *nigamadīkṣita*-s as eligible for the works of cook and assistant in temple. Was this stricter option a way to avoid dispute and to keep control on all the personnel of the temple?

Another reason for this *dīkṣā* may be that it was set up to popularize the Vaikhānasa community against a Pāñcarātra community of growing influence in towns. We saw already (see §2 *supra*) that the texts of the Vaikhānasāgama commonly declare that the Pāñcarātra cult is meant for the search of release only and is not suitable for cities and villages. There are historical instances of the hostility between the two sects and of their fight to control the cult in Vaiṣṇava temples of South India. Both Vaikhānasa and Pāñcarātra texts reflect this fight when they evoke the expiation to be practised when a temple was previously in the hands of the adverse sect.[31]

Apart from the problems linked with a Vaikhānasa *dīkṣā*, another set of questions concern the Bhāgavata-s. These are not mentioned in texts like *VK* or *JK*. They are mentioned as a sub-group of the Pāñcarātra tradition in several other Vaikhānasa texts. They form a separate group and an autonomous tradition in *ĀS*. As the *ĀS* is probably a later text, one would be tempted to evoke several progressive stages from the emergence to the entire autonomy of the Bhāgavata group. But the definition of the *bhāgavata*-s in the Vaikhānasa texts is not homogeneous enough to confirm this hypothesis. Moreover no Bhāgavata book is mentioned.

The multiplicity found in the definition of the Bhāgavata-s has also to do with the variation in the Vaikhānasa definitions of the Pāñcarātra adherents. As seen earlier, the affiliation to the Pāñcarātra group or to a Pāñcarātra sub-group may depend either on the adherence to a particular *sūtra*, or on the social origin, or even on the *āśrama*: it is possible that there was not a unique Pāñcarātra sect but several; it may be also that the Bhāgavata group had its specific texts which could have been later on included in the Pāñcarātra literature.

A sect may integrate the members and the religious heritage of another group either because this sect is developing or because the other group has a diminishing social reality or for another reason. Thus we see that even the exclusive Vaikhānasa community attempted to integrate non-Vaikhānasa-s into its circles by initiation; they even claimed the third *āśrama* as Vaikhānasa and imposed the rite of *nyāsa-cakra* from Vaikhānasa hands to *vānaprastha*-s. The identification of all *vānaprastha*-s as so-called *smārta-vaikhānasa*-s was also a way to connect two meanings of the word *vaikhānasa*: *vaikhānasa* as hermit and *vaikhānasa* as the name of a sect.

Thus the classification of Vaiṣṇava sects as found in Vaikhānasāgama brings many interesting data on the interrelation between different groups, and also provides new elements to solve problems like that of conversion in ancient Hinduism.

Notes

1. For the bibliographical references of the Vaikhānasa texts, see G. Colas, *Le Temple selon Marīci*, Pondichéry, 1986, P.I.F.I. no. 71, pp. 302-303.

2. In his *Agamas and South Indian Vaisnavism* (Madras, 1982), p. 112, V. Varadachari rightly remarks that the *Anubandha Ka* (= App. I) to the 1943 edition of the *Samūrtārcanādhikaraṇa* (including its chapters 3 and 4 which contain details about non-Vaiṣṇava *siddhānta*-s) does not appear authentically Vaikhānasa.

3. We use the second edition (Tirupati, 1960).

4. Edition of Īgāvāripāḷem (1927): see Colas, p. 4.

5. *JK* 108, p. 199; *viṣṇos tantram*: *YA* 51, 1-4; *SA* 78, 1 and sqq; *KrA* 27, 79 and sqq; *KhA* 41, 1-2. See also *VK* 73, pp. 457-458; *ĀS* 13, 1-4.

6. For the distinction *mukhya* (or *śreṣṭha*)/*gauṇa*, see *ĀS* 13, 1-2; *YA* 51, 53 and sqq; *KrA* 27, 80b-81a; *SA* 65, 121b-122; 68, 25; 77, 9.

7. *VK* 73, p. 457; *ĀS* 13, 1; *KhA* 41, 1-2; *KrA* 27, 79-80; *PA* 30, 5b and 6b; *SA* 78, 5a; 80, 12a; 80, 20b; etc.

8. *JK* 108, p. 199; *YA* 51, 8a; *KhA* 41, 2 and sqq.

9. It is said to be *aihikāmuṣmika* or *aihikāmuṣmikaphalaprada*: *VK* 73, p. 457; *ĀS* 13, 1; *PA* 30, 6b; *KrA* 27, 80b.

10. Several other texts speak more precisely of Vaiṣṇava Brahmins: *SA* 65, 122b-123; *YA* 51, 3a; *KhA* 41, 6b-7a.

11. *VK* 73, p. 458; *JK* 108, p. 199; *KhA* 41, 3-4a; *PA* 30, 8b; *SA* 65, 121a; 78, 8; 80, 15a.

12. *SA* 80, 5a; *JK* 108, p. 199; *ĀS* 13, 1 and 2; *PA* 30, 5b; *KhA* 41, 1 and 2 bis; *KrA* 27, 80a.

13. *PA* 30, 8a; *VK* 73, p. 457; *ĀS* 13, 2.

14. *JK* 108, p. 199; *KhA* 41, 1-3; *PA* 30, 7a; *SA* 78, 2.

15. *VK* 73, p. 458; *SA* 78, 9; *JK* 108, p. 199; *KhA* 41, 4-7; *PA* 30, 9b-10.

16. See D. Smith, *A descriptive bibliography of the printed texts of the Pāñcarātrāgama*, vol. II (Baroda, 1980), pp. 52-53; Varadachari, pp. 149-150.

17. We understand that the *śloka* 125 presents the description of the Kātyāyanādi followers.

18. As quoted by Varadachari, p. 157.

19. As edited by V. Krishnamacharya, Madras, 1969.

20. We will not enter into the details of the definition of several terms like *dīkṣā*, *nyāsacakra*, for lack of space; we will eventually mention the Sanskrit commentary of the editor of the *ĀS*, R. Bhaṭṭar Pārthasārathi Kṛṣṇamācārya.

21. *ĀS* 8, 13a and 8, 18b (where *aukheya* = *vaikhānasa*); 8, 15b; 8, 31b.

22. *Ibid.* 4, 17b-18a. The Sanskrit commentary (p. 111) includes in this category those initiated by Vaikhānasa-s too and this could be supported by the insertion of the *śloka* 7 in the chapter 8 which presents this classification. However this *śloka* may be an interpolation and the interpretation of the commentator looks more like an attempt to adapt this division to the other classification of Vaiṣṇava-s presented by the *ĀS* (see *infra*, same §5).

23. These two texts as quoted by D. Smith I (Baroda, 1975), pp. 81 and 234-237.

24. 19, 522-524, in the ed. of Śrī Govindācārya, Śrīraṅgam, 1953.

25. 38, 295-309, in the ed. of H.H. Śrī Yatirāja Sampathkumara, Bangalore, 1934.

26. *taptamudrāṃkaṇam*.

27. *ĀS* 4, 54; 8, 17b-18a; 11, 18.

28. But, according to *ĀS* 9, 11a, the *śuddha-vaiṣṇava*-s *may* also wear the *taptacakra*.

29. This is especially true for the hermits without wife, according to the description given in *Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra* 9, 5.

30. Compare with *KrA* 36, 41-42a; *YA* 51, 36-37.

31. *VK* 73, p. 458; *JK* 108, p. 200; *KhA* 41, 13 and sqq; *KrA* 27, 98 and sqq. Among Pāñcarātra texts, see *PārameśvaraS* 19, 549; *ĪśvaraS* (19, 458) and *AniruddhaS* (29, 16b) as quoted by D. Smith II, p. 104.

The utility of Tantras in modern times

by V.V. Dvivedi[1]

1. Tantrik literature is one of the branches of the vast tree of ancient Indian literature. Today we have gathered to discuss *tantra-śāstra*, the content of tantrik literature. The title of this paper indicates that I am not going to discuss the results of my research into tantrik doctrine and practice. Instead, I should like to discuss the relevance of tantrik ideology, as I understand it, to our problem-ridden existence in today's world. Human society is hopelessly fragmented by differences, differences of nation, race, language, religion, class, power, even dress; yet because of the deadly weapons now available and other scientific inventions, mankind needs now more than ever to live in harmony and learn tolerance. Can *tantra-śāstra* supply the key to the solution of this problem?

2. Before attempting an answer, let me determine the scope of tantrik literature. Most of the ancient sectarian works fall into three groups and, regardless of group, into four sections. Although some scholars have held that the Vaiṣṇava sacred texts are called *saṃhitā*, the Śaiva are called *āgama*, and the Śākta and Buddhist are called *tantra*, and that these are separate genres, I have refuted this view in my article "Āgama āṇi tantraśāstra" (written in Marathi).[2] Though variously called *saṃhitā, āgama* and *tantra*, texts of all three groups have the same structure, being divided into four sections: *vidyā, kriyā, yoga* and *caryā*. It is thus easy to see, even when they use other terms for those sections, that all the texts belong to a single overarching genre. This genre I should like to call the *tantra-śāstra* in its wider sense. Thus the Vaiṣṇava *āgama* of the Pāñcarātra, Vaikhānasa and Bhāgavata sects; the Śaiva *āgama* of Pāśupata, Siddhānta, Kālāmukha, Kāpālika, Kaula, Pratyabhijñā, Vīraśaiva, etc. sects; the *āgama* of the Śāktas, teaching various *vidyā* and rituals; the Buddhist *āgama* divided into four groups: *kriyā, caryā, yoga* and *anuttara*; the Jaina *āgama* teaching the ritual worship of such deities as Padmāvatī - all these sacred texts are to be included in the genre called *tantra-śāstra*.

3. It is well known that *tantra-śāstra* is vast. Dr. R.G. Bhandarkar[3] and Dr. Hemcandra Raichowdhury[4] have established the antiquity of the Pāñcarātra and Pāśupata sects. In the ancient Buddhist literature there are descriptions of Pāñcarātra and Pāśupata rituals.[5] The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (13,6,1) describes the Pāñcarātra *sattra*. The *ekāyana vidyā* mentioned by the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* (7,1,2) is indeed another name of

the Pāñcarātra *āgama*. The *Mahābhārata* in its *Nārāyaṇīya* section clearly says: "O sage-king, Sāṃkhya, Yoga, Pāñcarātra, the Vedas and Pāśupata are to be regarded as knowledges belonging to various (religious) disciplines". In the same place (349, 65-8) it says that Kapila was the teacher of Sāṃkhya, Hiraṇyagarbha of Yoga, Apāntaratamas of the Vedas, Śrīkaṇṭha of Pāśupata and God Himself of Pāñcarātra. Elsewhere it is said: "Sāṃkhya, Yoga, Pāñcarātra, the Vedas and Pāśupata - the views of these are self-evident and not to be refuted by reasoning". The same *Nārāyaṇīya* section of the *Mahābhārata* (12, 336, 10f) describes King Vasu Uparicara worshipping Nārāyaṇa with non-violent sacrifice in accord with Pāñcarātra ideology. The worship of Vāsudeva is mentioned in very old inscriptions and in texts like Pāṇini,[6] and historians have accepted that this worship belonged to Pāñcarātra religion. Both *Black* and *White Yajurveda*s, in the *Śatarudriya* chapter,[7] describe the glory of Rudra. Here Rudra is said to be worshipped also by burglars, thieves, *śūdra* and degraded *śūdra*. In the *Saṃhitā* and *Āraṇyaka* of the *Black Yajurveda*[8] the five forms of Rudra, viz. Aghora, Vāmadeva, etc., are mentioned, and so are some of the rituals associated with him, such as smearing ash. These descriptions are very like those given by the author of the *Pāśupata Sūtra*. This is confirmed by the statement in the *Mahābhārata* that Śrīkaṇṭha was the first teacher of the Pāśupata sect.

4. Thus we can say that the Pāśupata and Pāñcarātra sects respectively form the foundations of all later Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava sects. Even before the rise of the Buddhist and Jain religions, these two early sects introduced reformation to the Vedic religion. But, unlike the Buddhists and Jains, they accepted the authority of the Vedas. Here again one may mention the example of Vasu Uparicara. This worshipper of Nārāyaṇa mastered the art of flying, but he lost it the moment he supported the practice of killing in sacrifice (*Mbh.* 12, 337, 1-17).

5. The sacred texts of the Pāñcarātra and Pāśupata sects are known as the *āgama* literature. This literature not only reformed Vedic religion but in due course Buddhism as well. Mahāyāna Buddhism came into existence through the influence of *āgama*. Indeed its religious arts - sculpture, architecture, painting, music, etc. - were greatly influenced by the *āgama*. Usually *āgama-śāstra* is divided into four sections: *vidyā, kriyā, yoga, caryā*. The *vidyā* section usually contains discussions on doctrine and metaphysics, the *kriyā* and *caryā* sections, wherever relevant, discuss the arts, and the *yoga* section describes yogic practices. All later *tantra* of the Śaivas, Śāktas, Buddhists etc. developed the basic tenets of the

āgama-śāstra. In fact, the terms *āgama-śāstra* and *tantra-śāstra* are really synonymous.

6. Dr. Ramakrsna Gopala Bhandarkar presented in his book, besides the tenets of the Vaiṣṇavas and Śaivas, the tenets of the Śāktas, the Gāṇapatyas, the Sauras and the Skāndas. After him, although scholars were busy studying the *āgama* and *tantra* of Vaiṣṇavas, Śaivas, Śāktas and Buddhists separately, for a long time none of them appeared to be aware of the similarities between these tantrik sects. But scholars are now aware of the fact that recently the Mahamahopadhyaya Pandit Gopinath Kaviraj has started a comparative study of the entire *āgama* and *tantra-śāstra*.

7. In ancient Vedic religion the caste system and the practice of killing animals in sacrifice were strong. These were resisted in the *Upaniṣad*s and in the literature of Tantriks, Buddhists and Jains. As time passed, the Upaniṣadic doctrines were incorporated in Vedic literature as the "knowledge section" (*jñāna-kāṇḍa*). The Buddhists and Jains questioned the validity of the Vedic tradition. The tantrik tradition followed a middle course between these two extremes. From the time of the *Mahābhārata* down to the time of Puṣpadanta, author of the *Mahimnaḥ Stotra*, Indian literature considered the Vedas, the Sāṃkhya, Yoga, Pāñcarātra and Pāśupata traditions to be of equal value.[9] A synthesis of all these traditions is to be found in the *Rāmāyaṇa, Mahābhārata, Bhagavadgītā* and *Purāṇa*s. The authors of the late digests (*nibandha*) of the *dharma-śāstra* accepted the authority of the *tantra-śāstra* along with that of the Vedas, the *Manu-smṛti*, etc.. In Buddhism and Jainism there evolved a tradition of meditation and ritual worship which closely resembled the practices of the Śaiva, Śākta and Vaiṣṇava traditions. In all these sectarian religions the fundamental tenets are the same. In fact, Indian culture as we see it today shows more tantrik than Vedic influence.

8. *Tantra-śāstra* is a distinct tradition in ancient Indian culture. Scholars hold that its origin goes back to prehistoric times. Its ancient form can be found in the *Atharva Veda* and *Yajur Veda*. There are statements in Vedic literature like "The letter *a* is indeed all speech" (*Aitareya Āraṇyaka* 2,3,6) and "*A* is *brahman*" (*ibid.* 2,3,8) which remind one of the concept of *mātṛkā*, which came to be so much expanded in the *tantra* of the Śaivas, Śāktas and Buddhists. Scholars have already proved that Vedic literature mentions tenets of Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava sects. But instead of calling them Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava sects, the scholars should have referred to them as Pāśupata and Pāñcarātra respectively, because the names Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava emerged at a much later date under the influence of the

Purāṇas. The latter show no original development of ideas; they rather put forward a grand synthesis of all the best tenets of the Vedas, the Yoga, Sāṃkhya, Pāñcarātra, Pāśupata, Buddhists and Jains on the one hand and of the doctrines of the contemporary Śākta, Saura, Gāṇapatya and Skānda sects on the other. The foremost aim of the *Purāṇa*s was to harmonize different sects and doctrines. It is only through analytical study of the *Purāṇa*s that one can show the historical development of Indian religions and culture. Not only the *Purāṇa*s but also the sectarian *Upaniṣad*s should be studied in the same analytical way. In these texts one can witness attempts to synthesize new religious currents as they welled up at various times and to accommodate them within the structure of traditional religion. This state of affairs has indeed been pointed out by the Dutch scholar Professor Jan Gonda.

9. Every person who is initiated into tantrik religion has the right to worship God according to the tantrik system. In this religion there exist no barriers created by such things as caste. From this point of view, one may say that the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* too had a strong sense of human equality. The stories of Satyakāma Jābāla (4,4), Mahīdhara Aitareya (3,16) and Raikva Jānaśruti (4,1-2) support this tantrik doctrine. The discussion between Devakīputra and Ghora Āngirasa in this text also reminds one of Pāñcarātra doctrines. I have mentioned above that the *ekāyana vidyā* mentioned in this text (7,1,2) is a synonym for Pāñcarātra. The *dhruvā smṛti* (steadfast recollection) described in the same text is a term later used by Rāmānuja in his Vedānta to describe the nature of *bhakti* (devotion) and *prapatti* (self-surrender). Again, scholars have agreed that the *Bhagavadgītā* is strongly influenced by the Pāñcarātra.[10] It states (5,8): "The learned are impartial towards a *brāhmaṇa* who is educated and modest, a cow, an elephant, a dog or an outcaste". It also declares (9,32): "Women, *vaiśya, śūdra* - even these are entitled to salvation".

Lakulīśa, the last of the twenty-eight founding teachers of the Lakulīśa-Pāśupata sect, is held by scholars to be a historical person who flourished in the 2nd century AD at the place called Kāyāvarohaṇa Tīrtha.[11] He asserted that all gods are encompassed within one's body (*sarvadevamayaḥ kāyaḥ, TĀ 15, 604*). His was the original concept on which all later statements of the identity between microcosm and macrocosm have been based. There is indeed a special tantrik ritual, performed mentally, which achieves this identity. All branches of the *āgama* and *tantra* literature mentioned above accept these tenets of the *Bhagavadgītā* and of Lakulīśa.

10. All *āgama* and *tantra śāstra* agree that internal, mental purity is superior to external purity. The above-mentioned mental, internal rituals are performed to control human passions such as attachment, hatred, greed, delusion, sexual desire and anger. The process of these mental rites is revealed in the works of Śivānanda, Amṛtānanda, Bhāskararāya, etc., and in such texts as *Subhagodayavāsanā, Saubhāgyahṛdaya-stotra, Cidvilāsa, Varivasyārahasya, Vijñānabhairava* and *Saṃketapaddhati*. The Buddhist *tantra* too prescribe the same mental rituals in the form of their seven types of *anuttara pūjā*: confession of one's faults, empathizing with other people's merit, transferring one's merit, taking refuge in the three jewels, dedicating one's life, asking for instruction, arousing the thought of enlightenment. Moreover, development of the four holy mental states (*catur-brahma-vihāra-bhāvanā*), purification of the nature of all phenomena (*sarva-dharma-prakṛti-pariśuddhatā*) and meditation on the inessentiality of all phenomena (*sarva-dharma-śūnyatā-bhāvanā*) are parts of the mental ritual. The *Yogasūtra* of Patañjali explains that the four holy mental states described in the Buddhist *tantra* are "calming the mind by the development of kindness, compassion, sympathetic joy and equanimity towards pleasure and pain, merit and demerit" (1,33): this is stated to be the primary means of attaining such tranquillity. The Jaina teacher Umāsvāmin teaches the same thing in his *Tattvārthasūtra* (7,11). There is a *Pāśupata sūtra* (5, 27) about purification of speech. Who would not want to acquire purity of speech and thought?

11. Abhinavagupta showed his broadminded acceptance of all ancient religious traditions in his definition of the term *āgama*: "*Āgama* means well-known religious teachings or discourse" (*TĀ* 35, 1-2); "The word 'well-known' means a harmonious knowledge derived from verbal sources" (35,19). Elsewhere he says: "*Āgama* consists of verbal communication. The blessed Ananta said that (religious) teaching is given through the medium of speech, which communicates the teacher's personally experienced truth" (*IPVV* 3). He further said: "This idea of truth becomes revealed to a particular person and thus becomes communicated to the public through him and thus is labelled with his name. But actually the truth has nothing to do with a specific person, in the sense of his having discovered something new. There is no one fixed person called the Buddha. When the idea of the momentariness of all phenomena dawned in the mind of somebody through long practice of meditative concentration on the meaning of the truth, he was called the Buddha. But he himself must have received this idea from his teacher, a previous Buddha. And the line must thus go back to God Himself as the primal teacher, because all reflection (*vimarśa*) rests in God. Similarly, Kapila was only the recipient of the

revelation of the twenty-four categories. Therefore all textual religious traditions are eternal" (*IPVV*, 3, pp.89-104). "Hence Varāhamihira has said that all deities worshipped by various peoples are the same. The Bhāgavatas worship Viṣṇu, Maghas the Sun, ash-besmeared *brāhmaṇa* Śambhu, those who know about the circle of Mothers worship the Mothers, and the *brāhmaṇa* Brahmā. The Śākyas worship the Buddha embodied for the benefit of all beings, the naked (Jain ascetics) worship the Arhats. All should worship their own deity with their own ritual" (*ibid.*). Thus one should have no doubt that all sacred texts of all religions fall into the category of *āgama*, and all truly inspired teachers of those religions are to be accepted as authorities.

12. In the Buddhist and the Śākta *tantra* one comes across such statements as "Therefore *ātman* is indeed God"[12] and "It is said that it is one's own self which is called the Goddess Lalitā in her cosmic form".[13] Advayavajra asserted, "Light is indeed God".[14] In the philosophy of *pratyabhijñā*, the self is said to be both light and reflection. For example, the following statements assert the meaning of light to be knowledge, awareness, experience, etc.:

> *Prakāśalakṣaṇaḥ svātmā ... sa eva hi ahaṃbhāvātmā vimarśaḥ. Prakāśarūpatā jñānaṃ. Tatraiva svātantryātmā vimarśaḥ kriyā. Vimarśaś cāntaḥkṛtaprakāśa iti vimarśa eva parāvasthāyāṃ jñānakriye ... Sarvathā tu vimarśa eva jñānam.* *IPVV* 1, pp. 423-4.
>
> *Prakāśa eva saṃvidāṃ paramārthaḥ.* *IPVV* 2, p. 433.
>
> *Iha bhāvānāṃ sattvam asattvaṃ vā vyavatiṣṭhamānaṃ saṃvidviśrāntim antareṇa nopapadyate. Saṃvidviśrāntā hi bhāvāḥ prakāśamānā bhavanti ... prakāśa eva saṃvid yataḥ.* *IPVV* 1, pp. 4-5.
>
> *Prakāśasvātantryam iha bodhasaṃvedanādiśabdavācyam.* *IPVV* 1, p. 82.

Tantrāloka 1,52 says that Śiva is essentially light. That the self is God is strongly affirmed at *MMP* p. 119 and in the following quotation:

> *Sā (devatā) ca yuktiparyālocanāyāṃ svātmasaṃvitsphurattāmātrasvarūpeti prakāśa eva viśvopāsyā devatā.* *MMP* pp. 4-5.

I think neither the Cārvākas (Indian materialists) nor modern scientists would object to this gloss on the highest reality.

13. Śaiva, Śākta and Buddhist *tantra* accept the idea that in this one life one may attain salvation. His Holiness Avadhūtasiddha said that salvation can be attained in one life (*Bhaktistotra* verse 30). The same can be found in *Guhyasiddhi* 4,58 and 5,6; in the *Śivadharma* and *Śivadharmottara*;

in *Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇatantra* 6, 159. The Muslims, Christians and some other religious groups do not believe in the theory of transmigration. For them these tantrik statements describing salvation in one life can be more acceptable than otherwise.

14. In the *pratyabhijñā* system, Bhaṭṭa Utpala introduced monism in place of dualism (*IPVV* 3, p.405) and thus did a great service to the Śaivas. He also innovated in his theory of *brahman*, putting *māyāśakti* in the place of *avidyā*. His view of the non-duality of consciousness means that the self is God. He thus showed an easy way to remove suffering. Similarly, even today one should rely on teachings of *āgama* and *tantra* to revise one's notions of purity and impurity, religious injunctions and prohibitions, and the problems of caste barriers to create unity among all peoples.

15. *MMP* p.145 and *Yoginīhṛdayadīpikā* are texts which corroborate the view that the evils of caste discrimination are the major source of pain. Abhinavagupta, quoting two *trika* verses, briefly referred to a religious practice called *aṣṭavidhā samatā*.[15] The *Śaktisaṃgama Tantra* slightly elaborates on this practice. It says that the *samatāṣṭaka mārga* is to practice eight types of non-discrimination: towards all created beings, all vocations, all viewpoints, all things, all stages, all *ovallī*, all deities and all castes (2. 18f.). The followers on this path meditate on these eight forms of non-discrimination. The hindrances to this path are collectively called *pāśa* or *āgraha*. The *Tantrāloka* (15,595-6) enumerates the *āgraha* as craving generated by caste, education, lineage, culture, physique, country, qualities and wealth. The *Kulārṇava Tantra* (13,90) enumerates the eight *pāśa* as hatred, fear, doubt, embarrassment, disgust, lineage, caste and character. Moreover, the *MMP* (p.145) and the *Yoginīhṛdaya Tantra* (1,72) enumerate the same eight *pāśa*, and thus the Vedic caste discrimination is thoroughly undermined.

16. Abhinavagupta draws on the authority of texts from the *Mokṣa-dharma, Mukuṭa Saṃhitā, Svacchanda Tantra* etc. in arguing against caste discrimination. Kṣemarāja describes the *Bhairava Tantra*s as rescuers from caste discrimination (*SvU* 2, 136). Maheśvarānanda too says that on the authority of the *āgama* and on the strength of one's own conviction one should abandon all differentiation between castes. Moreover, the notion of difference creates fear. Non-dualism teaches that all evils are caused by discrimination (*vikalpa*). The idea of difference leads to spiritual isolation. This produces selfishness, doubt, fear and greed as well as hatred. The absence of these base emotions facilitates friendliness and compassion

towards all fellow beings and brings internal peace and harmony. The *āgama* and *tantra* discuss all the religious injunctions and prohibitions just to remove the doubts and fears of their followers.

17. Maheśvarānanda argued the futility of śāstrik injunctions and prohibitions by saying that the injunction to perform the *sandhyā* rite and the prohibition on eating the meat of an animal killed by a poisonous weapon cannot be held to be universal laws, since there can always be people who do just the opposite. This proves that the act of following a śāstrik precept depends largely on personal choice. Hence it is choice that should be one's main guide for personal behaviour. As his authorities he quotes the *Saṃvitprakāśa* and the *Saṃvidullāsa*. The former says that one should regard as prohibited those acts which it is possible to avoid and regard as enjoined those acts which it is impossible to avoid. The latter text says that for all injunction and prohibition the only authority is Śiva, since he can cancel all śāstrik injunctions (*MMP* pp.21-2). Abhinavagupta upheld the same view at *Tantrasāra* pp.31-2: though food may be marked as pure and impure by śāstrik injunction, those are not essential qualities of the objects; the ascribed characteristics are simply imaginary and one should not torment oneself with these matters. Naturally the Buddhist *tantra* treat these matters in the same way.

18. *Tantra* teaches us that sound reasoning and one's own understanding should be able to decide all such matters. Taking *Mālinīvijaya Tantra* 17,18 as his proof, Abhinavagupta declares (*TĀ* 4,15) that reasoning is the best part of yoga. For him the expressions "sound reasoning" and "personal judgment" mean that one's judgment should be developed through the teaching of one's guru and the study of *śāstra*; but for a fully developed religious scholar his own capacity for reason and understanding should be the best guide. The *Mukuṭa Saṃhitā* also states that in all matters of decision the only means is one's own enlightened reasoning. The *Yogavāsiṣṭha* (*NP* 41,15) advises that enlightenment comes not from the teaching of the *śāstra*, nor from the guru's admonition, but is achieved by the self through knowledge.

19. Quoting the *Mahānayaprakāśa*, Maheśvarānanda remarks (*MMP* p.116): "Often people are greedy for sex, for alcohol and for meat". Valmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa* says (3,103,30): "The food (*anna*) which is consumed by the human being is also consumed by his gods". Let ordinary people who worship food (material comfort) seek satisfaction in the use of alcohol, meat and sex if that pleases their soul - which is essentially God. But others, on the authority of *Manu* 5,56, should understand that renuncia-

tion effects great results, i.e., salvation. It is desirable that people should follow the doctrine of non-duality of the *pratyabhijñā* system and so try to realize that the individual self is identical with the cosmic self. We, the students of *tantra-śāstra*, would like to suggest that in our practices we should to some extent mitigate the stringent laws of caste prohibition laid down by the Vedic religion. At the same time we should differentiate the truly yogic components of tantrik ritual from the practices known as the three (words beginning with) *m* (the meat and wine consumed as ritual food and the ritual use of sexual intercourse) when we practise the tantrik religion. We should learn to hold mental worship as of greater value than external worship, and gradually merge our self-centred view of the world into a realization of our oneness with the cosmic Self. To my mind this is where *tantra* is applicable in modern times.

20. To conclude, I should like to make a few observations. It is of great importance that we, mankind, considering all these matters, should learn that each people, while following the religion and culture of their country and community, should also learn to live in harmony and mutual understanding conducive to the formation of a global culture. First of all, while they are still under the impression that the world of differentiation is real, people should try to live up to the Upaniṣadic dictum and respect each other by considering everyone to be a god. When by regular practice people have rid themselves of the mental deficiencies of doubt and mistrust, they should follow the above-mentioned path of non-dualism by consciously practising *viśvāhaṃtā*, i.e., considering oneself one with the cosmos. This is the only way to ensure the success of such institutions as the United Nations Organization. In this way at least political unity may be achieved worldwide. This would lead to the idea of citizenship of the world rather than of individual nations. This will also abolish the inequality of status which exists in today's politics.

It is a fact that, despite differences of tradition caused by differences of place and time, human speculative power is everywhere the same. This is borne out by the remarkable similarity between ancient Greek and Indian philosophical thought. In fact, all world literature ancient and modern has a remarkable similarity. Therefore when studying world literature one should try to rise above the differences caused by place and religion and try to assess the history of human progress as a whole over time. On a small scale this can be done in assessing the progress of culture in India. Here, throughout the ages and over vast regions, developed various religious traditions - Vedic, Buddhist, Jain, etc.. But their literature contains an amazing similarity of speculative thought. Instead of seeing this unity of thought, scholars tend to study the

sources piecemeal and by this thoroughly misguided process derive a narrow and fragmented view of Indian religion. It is preferable to undermine one's own religious dogmatism and one's worries about the hereafter, and to pay attention to matters which pertain to the here and now, and to the whole of mankind. Only thus can pan-human culture flourish and lead to the unity of all, even in the face of the diversity caused by kingdoms, nations, language, race, religion and organization. Let there be unity amongst all nations of the world, and let the people of the West be in the vanguard of progress towards it!

Notes

1. The original Sanskrit of this article has been rendered into English by Sanjukta Gupta.
2. In: *Prācina Bhāratīya vidyece punardarśana*", Poona 1978, p.181-196. Hindi version in: V.V. Dvivedi, "*Āgama aur Tantraśāstra*", Delhi 1984, p.1-26.
3. "*Vaishnavism, Śaivism and Minor Religious Systems*".
4. "*Early History of the Vaishnava Sect*".
5. Bhandarkar, *Vaishnavism*, p.3; *Dhammapada* 4.
6. Bhandarkar, *o.c.*, p.3-4.
7. *TS* 4,5; *MS* 16.
8. *MS* 2,9,1 and 10; *TĀr* 10,43-47.
9. For argumentation, see "*Āgama aur Tantraśāstra*", p.9-10.
10. See B.G. Tilak, "*Bhāgavata dharma kā udaya aur Gītā*", in the Introduction to his *Gītārahasya*.
11. See K.C. Pandey, "*Śaivadarśanabinduḥ*", p.27-29.
12. *Prajñopāyaviniścayasiddhi* 5,33.
13. *Mahārthamañjarīparimala*, p.119; *Tantrarāja* 35,13.
14. *Aavayavajrasaṃgraha*, p.57.
15. *TĀ* 4,274 and comm.

The Ātman as charioteer: Treatment of a Vedic allegory in the Kulālikāmnāya

Teun Goudriaan

"It's turned wery dark, sir. Is there any light a-comin?"
"It is coming fast, Jo."
Fast. The cart is shaken all to pieces, and the rugged road is very near its end.

(Charles Dickens, *Bleak House*, Oxford U.P. ed. 1948, repr. 1978, p. 649)

Although it is well known that Tantrism and Vedism have some mutual connections,[1] little systematic study has been made of particular Vedic reminiscences in early Tantric literature. One of these, concerning the Ātman, shall be treated below in a preliminary way. At this juncture, a threefold limitation imposes itself: firstly, the philosophical and terminological implications of the vexed problem of the Ātman cannot be sufficiently grasped in the present limited scope; secondly, the literary background of the imagery remains insufficiently clear, while more relevant instances might turn up afterwards; and thirdly, the Tantric evidence discussed here is essentially confined to only one fragment from the Kulālikāmnāya which is mystifying to a considerable degree.

The exact nature of the relation between the Ātman as the eternal, unchangeable and, in its pure state, unattached Self on the one hand, and man's bound state in the round of existences on the other, has been elaborated in different ways in the philosophical and religious traditions of ancient Hinduism. In the present context, we concentrate on a popular, allegorical presentation of this relation in, philosophically spoken, marginal surroundings.

The superior position of the Self is metaphorically expressed in various ways. Thus, the Ātman is said to encompass the senses as the sun its rays (MaitrUp 6,31; Mbh. 12,197,14), or to govern and coordinate them like a king his executives (Mbh. 12,195,10). The most famous representation of this position of the Ātman is without doubt the simile of the chariot and its owner or charioteer. We shall try to point out how the author of the Kulālikāmnāya conceived of this simile, several instances of which may have been known to him, and tried to present a new and original teaching on the base of this time-honoured *exemplum*.

We shall first give a survey of a few important sources from the Upaniṣads and the Mahābhārata.

a. *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* 1,3,3-6.[2] This famous passage may be paraphrased as follows: the owner of the chariot (*ratha*) is the Ātman, his chariot is the body; the charioteer is Intelligence (*buddhi*), Mind is the reins; the horses are the senses, the distances covered by them are the objects of sense. The Ātman is the enjoyer of (the body) provided with senses and mind.[3] Whoever unwisely does not discipline his mind, that man's senses are beyond control, as ill-trained horses are for a charioteer. For the wise man, the reverse is true. At the end, the text states that the unwise man falls short of his destination and is caught in Saṃsāra, while the man of wisdom reaches his goal: Viṣṇu's supreme abode (vs. 9), at the end of his journey (*adhvanaḥ pāram*). The latter expression shows that the "owner of the chariot" is a traveller, not a chariot-fighter, as is also suggested by Śaṅkara in his commentary to this place.[4] The owner is a mere onlooker, who leaves all the details of the driving and technical provisions (including training and grooming of the horses) to his charioteer. It is suggested that the road is the present life - the sum of the objects of sense which are the horses' *gocarāḥ* - ; the theory of rebirth is not an integral part of the imagery.

b. *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* 2,9 contains a short allusion to the same image in a yogic context, presumably implying a comparison of the senses to ill-trained horses.[5] The yogin should regulate his breath and diligently hold his mind in check like a chariot (*vāha*). No further comparisons are made. The mind, not the body, is equated with the chariot; as already mentioned, the equation senses-horses is not made explicit. However short, the occurrence of the simile in this Upaniṣad shows that it was also known in an early Śaiva milieu.

c. *Maitrāyaṇīya Upaniṣad* 2,6 obviously contains a development of the imagery of the KaṭhUp as treated above; the body (not the mind) being again compared to a chariot (*ratham*).[6] We quote Van Buitenen's translation: "These orifices are the sensory faculties. They are his reins. The motorial faculties are his horses. The body is the chariot. The will (*manas*, T.G.) is the driver. The *prakṛti* is the goad".[7] Here, the metaphor is extended further, the most interesting innovation being that the senses are distinguished, in keeping with the development of Sāṃkhya theoretization, in senses of cognition, *buddhīndriyāṇi* (Van Buitenen: "sensory faculties") and of action (*karmendriyāṇi*). Only the latter are compared to horses; the former, being hierarchically superior, to reins. This time, mind is promoted to the position of charioteer (*niyantar*) and Nature (*prakṛti*) is introduced as the goad (*pratoda*), presumably because in the shape of the three primordial strands (*guṇa*) she always impels the

senses to action. It is further said in the Upaniṣad that the body, which is "like a potter's wheel impelled by the potter" is furnished with a basis "so that it has intelligence",[8] while He (the Self) sets it into motion.

d. *MaitrUp* 4,4. On this place in the same Upaniṣad, which is considered as interpolated by Van Buitenen,[9] "being made a chariot" (*rathita*) is a characteristic of Saṃsāric existence, from which one should release oneself in order to obtain intimate co-existence (*sāyujyam*, Van Buitenen: "union") with the (Universal) Self. For *rathita*, "being furnished with a chariot" (Monier Williams) is in my opinion to be preferred.

e. In *Bṛhad Āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 4,3,35, the situation is different:[10] "just as a cart (*anas*), being heavily loaded, goes on creaking,[11] in the same way this Corporeal Self, being mounted by the Intelligent Self, goes on creaking, at the moment of breathing one's last". The imagery belongs to the same sphere as in the preceding examples, but there are differences, three of which deserve special mention:

1. The vehicle is not a chariot (*ratha*), but a cart destined for carrying freight.

2. Two Selves are distinguished, the Intelligent (*prājña*) and the Corporeal (*śārīra*). The latter is mounted by the former, or rather loaded with it.

3. The metaphor is allegorized by the addition of a dynamic element: the cart creaks and perhaps succumbs at the moment of death. One might argue that Corporeal Self and body are different (although intimately connected) because the former is said only to creak while the body is destroyed in the process of dying. The Corporeal Self might be loaded again, thus continuing its existence through another (part of the) journey.

f. At first sight, the body itself seems to have been expressly compared to a freight carriage in *MaitrUp* 2,3 (Van Buitenen, p. 99), where the Vālakhilyas instruct Prajāpati on its nature: "Reverend Sir, this body is devoid of consciousness like a cart (*śakaṭam*); whose greatness in this, that it is furnished with a basis, as if it were conscious? Who sets it into motion? ...".[12] This situation is, however, to be connected directly with MaitrUp 2,6 discussed above. The reader can hardly escape the idea that for the author of this Upaniṣad, *ratha* and *śakaṭa* were synonyms.

g. *Chāgaleya Upaniṣad*, par. 6-7.[13] In this minor Upaniṣad written in pseudo-Vedic language, we find another variety, rather circumstantially expressed, of the cart imagery. The instructors, a group of child-sages, impart spiritual illumination to their pupils by showing them a vision of

"the chariot-course of a creaking chariot".[14] This chariot is compared to a horse from Balkh which advances fast, galloping and throwing its hoofs upward. The function of the chariot is to conduct its driver (*yantar*, = *niyantar*, cf. Mbh. 11,7,15) to his destination, just as the horse conducts a king or aristocrat to his destination. However, as soon as the driver, here called *takṣan* "mechanic", having arrived, descends and goes his way, the cart is seen to fall asunder.[15] The vision is explained as follows: the impeller (*pracodayitar*), who might be or not be the same as the driver, is the Ātman; the horses which draw the chariot are the senses, various parts of the chariot are parts of the body and therefore, by implication, the chariot is the body. Karman (not Prakṛti) is the goad, and - a novelty - speech is the grinding (*kvāṇanam*) of the chariot. As in the BṛhĀUp, the Self who impels the chariot is called the Intelligent Self without whose presence the body disintegrates or is eaten by animals.[16]

The passage is secondary, yet claims some degree of originality. To the chariot imagery, it adds the element of speech, and the detailed equation of the parts of the body and of the chariot, which reminds of Nāgasena's exposition to King Milinda in the Milindapañha. The most intriguing feature is, that of the two selves mentioned in BṛhĀUp, only the Intelligent Self reappears in the ChāgUp. There might be two alternative explanations for this:

1. The Corporeal Self is silently understood and has in that case to be equated to the driver of the chariot.

2. No Corporeal Self is recognized apart from the Intelligent Self. In this case, the words *pracodayitar* "impeller" and *yantar* "driver" have synonymous functions, and the Self acts as charioteer. As we saw, also the *takṣan* may be identical with the driver. The easiest solution would therefore be to identify all three functionaries, assuming a unique Self.

h. The image of the ridden horse recurs in *Dhammapada* 322: "Praiseworthy are well-trained ... horses of Sindh ..., but even more praiseworthy is one who has subdued himself".[17] On several places, the Dhammapada gives evidence of the imagery of chariot and horses: 94 (the wise man controls his senses like a charioteer, *sārathi*, his horses); 151 and 171 (the body grows old, just as even beautiful royal chariots wither away); 159d (one's self is difficult to subdue); 222 (hold your wrath in check as a real charioteer his chariot); 143 (hold on like a noble steed). Nowhere in the Dhammapada do we find that the Self, or rather oneself (*attā*) acts as owner, overseer or charioteer of the chariot.

Reviewing the Upaniṣadic sources and the Dhammapada, one can distinguish four themes, the first of which is by far the most important:

1) The body is a chariot, the Self is the owner (perhaps originally the chariot-fighter), the senses are the horses; the Self is assisted by Intelligence or another superior aspect of the personality as charioteer (KaṭhUp; MaitrUp 2,6; ChāgUp?).

Two subsidiary applications of this image occur: 1a) ethical: be a good charioteer (Dhp. 94, 222).[18] This should of course be seen against the background of the Buddhist non-Ātman doctrine, or rather, of the absence of doctrinal implications in the original exhortative stage of a "pre-Dhammapada".[19] 1b) soteriological: driving a chariot is the image of Saṃsāra of which one should get rid (MaitrUp 4,4).

2) The body is a freight-cart which groans during or at the end of its journey. The Self is its driver (BṛhĀUp; reminiscence in MaitrUp 2,3; ChāgUp).

3) The body or psycho-physical organism should be a well-trained ridehorse (Dhp. 143, 222; ChāgUp).

4) A more distant theme is the comparison of life to a journey, as in Dhp. 237. The idea is implied also in theme 1), e.g. in KaṭhUp.

There are a few allusions to the same image in the Mahābhārata. In the first place, one is of course reminded of the famous setting of the Bhagavadgītā, where the Supreme Self - Kṛṣṇa - acts as charioteer to Arjuna, who may be considered as the Individual Self; thus creating as it were a reversal of roles compared to the situation in the BṛhĀUp and the KaṭhUp. We shall not try to integrate the BhGītā theme into our enquiry, because the battle motif so prominent in that text does not play a significant role in the other versions, while no allegorical explanation of the setting is offered by the Gītā itself.

More relevant are a few text-places from the eleventh and twelfth *parvans* of the Mbh. In the seventh chapter of the Strīparvan, Dhṛtarāṣṭra asks for more instruction about the Saṃsāra. In his answer, Vidura compares it to a protracted journey (*adhvan*) through a wilderness during which a man, compelled by fatigue, takes periods of rest during the nights (this implies an equation of life and day); as these intervals, one should consider the embryonic periods (vs. 4). During his journey, the unfortunate traveller is threatened or maltreated by various monsters, representing diseases of the body and measurements of time. "The chariot (*ratha*) in which the living beings (travel) is the body, the luminous principle (*sattva*) they say to be the charioteer; the senses are said to be the horses, the reins are intelligence-of-action (?, *karmabuddhi*)".[20] Anyone who lets the horses go as they please will roam in Saṃsāra, from which only the Self (or: oneself) can save one (vs. 18).

Here, we observe a close connection with KaṭhUp 1,3,3f. (for instance, Mbh. 11,7,13c = KaṭhUp 1,3,4a), but the charioteer is not Buddhi but Sattva, while *karmabuddhi* functions as the reins. This is in keeping with a tendency to connect Sattva, not with the three strands of inert Prakṛti, but with the guiding, luminous Self as operating in these Guṇas.[21] Themes 1 (body-chariot) and 4 (life journey) are present, while the application is soteriological. In subordination to this context, the ethical subtheme is also elaborated in vs. 19f.: one should yoke the "three horses of Brahman", viz. self-restraint (*dama*), abstention (*tyāga*) and vigilance (*apramāda*) to one's chariot, and hold morality (*śīla*) as reins in order to reach the world of Brahman at the end.

Other relevant places in the Śāntiparvan are 238,2: the individual Ātman (*kṣetrajña*) handles the senses as a charioteer his well-trained horses;[22] 240,14f.: the Ātman becomes visible when the senses are well disciplined by means of Manas. It is not clear whether the mind in the latter instance acts as charioteer or only functions as the reins; the idea is not worked out in detail.[23] A more distant variant occurs in 280,1: the sage has the mind as his chariot, the objects of the senses as horses, and reins of wisdom.[24]

The preceding instances have in common that their purpose is didactic (although sometimes with a tinge of the mystic in it) and that their exposition is therefore straightforward in principle. The early Tantric Kulālikāmnāya from the Kubjikāmata, with which we shall now deal at last, handles the theme in a different, highly idiosyncrasic manner.[25] There is also a mixture of popularized Āyurveda theory (the corporeal fluids, *doṣa*); the whole is encadred in a strange, aberrant style, a language more evocative than descriptive. We shall try to follow the argument by means of a paraphrase of Kulālikāmnāya (KMT) 25, 1-25.

In stanza 1, Kubjikā (the form of Devī peculiar to the school) interrogates her husband Bhairava-Śiva after his nature as the Five Ātmans, their engagement (*niyoga*) and size. In his answer, Bhairava enumerates these five: the Para "Supreme", Parāpara "Lower Supreme", Siddha "Perfect", Prasiddha "Going to perfection"?, and Pudgala "Individual". Their size is enormous and expressed in "millions" (*koṭi*; presumably millions of *aṅgulas*). The Pudgala is said to measure only "forty-eight", but this probably also means "forty-eight *koṭis*" (some manuscripts read "forty" instead of "forty-eight"). The smallest Ātman would then be the Prasiddha (36 *koṭis*) who is said to be *kāraṇeśvara* in 5b.

In vs. 7f., the Pudgala is said to be mounted on the Prasiddha's shoulders and to be goaded by the Siddha as charioteer.[26] "He follows the direction indicated to him, while the Parāpara looks on; he is impelled to

the performance of actions under the direction of the Para".[27] The term *karmavṛttau* "to the performance of actions" is not above doubt in the textual tradition. The ms. A reads *karmabuddhau*, which is in remarkable agreement with Mbh. 11,7,13 quoted above, where *karmabuddhi* is symbolically represented as the reins of the sense-horses. The closely related Ṣaṭsāhasrasaṃhitā (49,32) reads *karmavidhau*.[28] Two mss. of the Kulālikāmnāya (G and T, both scribes are prone to reinterpretation) give *karmabandhair* "(being checked) by the bonds of Karman". *Nīyate* "he is impelled" has a parallel in Mbh. 12,197,15, where the Internal Ātman is impelled on the road pointed out by Karman and at the end reaches the fruit of Karman: a good store of merit. This Antarātman is like the sun, has the senses as rays (*raśmi*, homonym with "reins") and obtains the five sense-qualities.[29]

In the Kulālikāmnāya, the Pudgala follows the different paths presided over by the three Śaktis of Śiva: Vāmā etc. On the path of Vāmā, he becomes exhausted under Nature's load (*prakṛtyarthabharālasaḥ*)[30] which causes the cart to break and the ox (?)[31] to die. At this moment, the charioteer (the Siddha) is crying while the Parāpara continues to look on impassively; the Para is not even mentioned (vs. 9). In vs. 10, the Pudgala is again on his way on the path of Vāmā and passes through rivers, ponds and seas. He amuses himself watching a cart race (*yānakrīḍāṃ ca paśyeta*),[32] while the Siddha as charioteer continues to impel him forward. All this happens while he is pressed down by a preponderance of *kapha* "phlegm". In case of a preponderance of bile (*pitta*), he is impelled on the path of Jyeṣṭhā. He then passes through rows of flames; he is harassed by hunger and thirst and attacked by robbers. He is engaged in battles but also embraced and kissed by women; his country is struck by calamities. In short, he lives an adventurous, "fiery" life, as one might say, with a special share of bad experiences.[33] It seems that in the course of these events the charioteer is killed,[34] and this time also the Parāpara becomes involved: he cries, while the Para is present as a looker-on.

In case of preponderance of "a mixture of phlegm and bile, or of wind" (?), he (the Pudgala) is impelled on the path of Raudrī (vs. 16). He now seems to fare better: he soars into the air (*khecarāmukhaḥ*; or: he obtains a bird's face?), visits the heavens and nether worlds and watches strange cities and landscapes. He is admitted into the circle of the Yoginīs, enjoying dance and song, and obtains the status of an anointed king with all paraphernalia.[35] Vs. 19 then contains a difficult interlude: the Pudgala is still on his way, oppressed by a mixture of wind and bile, "while the charioteer looks on and enjoys (*bhuñjate*), the Parāpara". The text may also be interpreted as: "while he looks on as charioteer (who?

the Prasiddha?) and enjoys the Parāpara" (several mss. reading *parāparam*). In case of pressure of wind (vs. 20f.), he is impelled along a long and difficult road, scorched or terrified by the sun; limping, he barely manages to struggle forward, and (at the end) he dies.[36]

Another time (21cd), the Pudgala is oppressed by a mixture of wind and phlegm while the Para himself is said to act as charioteer. His road is now blocked by serpents and other monsters who eat him or tear him away (22cd *khādyate ... mriyate nīyate 'pi vā*). Vs. 23f. then seem to contain a recapitulation: "thus the Pudgala, still mounted on the Prasiddha,[37] and having the Siddha as charioteer, in compliance with the power of the Parāpara, and impelled by the Para, plays (as it were) with the world of beings and objects".[38]

The teaching of the journey of the Five Ātmans is concluded in vs. 25 with the remark that it is "mystical" (*sarahasyam*) and can only be understood by those who have been initiated into the Śrīmata (the Kubjikā school). We might well take this to mind, as the passage is indeed very difficult to understand. First problem: is the life journey made by a horse-carriage, or by ox-cart or by neither of the two? No horse is mentioned, although the suggestion of a horse is implied in the word *sārathi*. We might imagine that the Prasiddha acts as a horse on whose back (but the text says: "shoulders") the Pudgala is riding. But what with the presence of a charioteer, this would be a strange vision indeed. On the other hand, an ox, or at least a bovine, is mentioned in vs. 9b, provided the interpretation is correct, and in vs. 20 by mss. AB (see n. 36). Unfortunately, as we saw above, the verse-quarter is not above doubt. The word *śakaṭa* (9a) suggests a freight-cart and the same impression is given by the various "loads" (*bhara* = *bhāra*, 8b, 12a etc.) which metaphorically denote the corporeal constituents *kapha* etc. Also here, the Prasiddha, on whose neck the Pudgala rides, might be identical with the animal; but the exact relation between these two Ātmans remains quite problematical.

The Pudgala in his turn is impelled by the Siddha or other forms of the Ātman as charioteer (or driver). The Para and Parāpara act alternatively as onlooker, i.e. "owner" of the chariot; one of the two is evidently superfluous in the allegory. As is suggested by a few terminological reminiscences, the image of chariot and charioteer may have been known to the author of the Kulālikāmnāya from the Mahābhārata or the Upaniṣads, but the better contacts seem to be with the latter. One of the most interesting parallels is with BṛhĀrUp 4,3,35, where one lower form of Self is loaded by a higher form. The adventures of the Pudgala in the Kulālikāmnāya remind of BṛhĀrUp 4,3,20: *atha yatrainaṃ ghnantīva jinantīva ... yatra deva iva rājeva ...* (21) ... *yathā priyayā striyā sampari-*

ṣvaktaḥ ...; but this might be coincidence. Still more remarkable is ChāndUp 8,12,3: *sa* (the Puruṣa) *tatra paryeti, jakṣat krīḍan ramamānaḥ strībhir vā yānair vā ... sa yathā prayogyācaraṇe yuktaḥ, evam evāyam asmin śarīre prāṇo yuktaḥ* "he makes his round there, eating, playing, amusing himself with women or chariots ... just as having been yoked to a conveyance, in the same way this Breath has been yoked to the body". It would seem that the traditional image has been utilized - and distorted - by the author of the KMT for a visionary presentation of his doctrine of the fivefold Ātman, the origin of which I could not yet detect.

Three tendencies can be observed in this Tantric version of the image of the chariot. 1) The scenario, which in the earlier versions was filled by aspects of the human personality (Buddhi etc.) has been peopled now by forms of the Ātman, presumably under the influence of a new mystic theory. The difference may partly be a question of terminology. One might consider the Pudgala to be the Corporeal Self, but the Prasiddha is perhaps a continuation of the Mind (*kāraṇeśvaraḥ*, KMT 25,5, "chief of the senses"?) and the Siddha of Buddhi (who is likewise the charioteer in KaṭhUp). The Parāpara might be an intermediate Ātman on a higher level, perhaps that of the Vijñānakevala, cf. Mālinīvijaya Tantra 1,22f. *ātmā caturvidho jñeyas, tatra vijñānakevalaḥ // malaikayuktaḥ* ... This problem has to be left as it stands; I hope to return to the question of the pluriform Ātman on another occasion.

2) The dynamic, allegorical character of the image has been strongly expanded. The subjects undergo a series of adventures, the enumeration of which even reminds of elaborated visions like that undergone by Nārada in the DevīBhāgPur (6,27-30). By the elaboration of this device, the version of the KMT stands aloof from the older versions of the chariot allegory.

3) As has already been remarked, the image has been further complicated by the introduction of the *doṣas* as factors of delusion. It is clearly said in the KMT that these affect the Pudgala; he is, in fact, "pressed down by their load" (e.g. 25,11 *kaphākrāntabharo*). The Pudgala is therefore very closely related to the body and its imperfections. As to the role of the *doṣas*, one might compare Mbh. 12,209,11 *tataḥ paśyaty asambaddhān vātapittakaphottarān* "Then (in the dream) he sees unconnected (images), being chiefly (determined by) wind, bile, and phlegm ...".

It seems that the image of the chariot is only marginal in the Kubjikā tradition. The Ṣaṭsāhasra Saṃh., a text which very often highly elaborates upon the contents of the KMT, now has nothing more to add than a few hardly interesting textual variants. But we should not forget to mention the view of the author of a commentary (Ṭippaṇī) to that same text.[39] He

distinguishes five groups of adventures which he connects with the five elements: earth (cf. KMT 25, vs. 8f.?), water ("he sees *jalādi sarvam*", vs. 10f.), fire (*jvālādikaṃ sarvam*, cf. 12-15), wind (vs. 20f.), and sky (*khecaragamanādikam*, i.e. vs. 16-18). But this seems too artificial. The occurrence of water, fire and wind in the description of the KMT should rather be connected with the three bodily fluids which disturb the inner harmony.

Notes

1. T. Goudriaan, in: Sanjukta Gupta a.o., *Hindu Tantrism* (Handbuch der Orientalistik, II, 7) Leiden a.o.: Brill, 1979, p. 15f.; D.J. Hoens, in: the same, p. 90f.

2. Text acc. to the Adyar Library ed., *"Daśopaniṣads"*, Adyar Libr. Series, 15, Madras 1935:

3 *Ātmānaṃ rathinaṃ viddhi śarīraṃ ratham eva tu /*
buddhiṃ tu sārathiṃ viddhi manaḥ pragraham eva ca //
4 *Indriyāṇi hayān* (text: *hayāny*) *āhur, viṣayāṃs teṣu gocarān /*
ātmendriyamanoyuktaṃ bhoktety āhur manīṣiṇaḥ //
5 *Yas tv avijñānavān bhavaty ayuktena manasā sadā /*
tasyendriyāṇy avaśyāni duṣṭāśvā iva sāratheḥ //
6 *Yas tu vijñānavān bhavati yuktena manasā sadā /*
tasyendriyāṇi vaśyāni sadaśvā iva sāratheḥ //

Note the parallellism of the last two stanzas, which constitutes a *yamaka* of the kind well known from Dhammapada 1ff.

3. Or: "the enjoyer is the combination of Ātman, senses and mind".

4. "Here is a chariot imagined for the Ātman, conditioned in Saṃsāra ...". *The Upaniṣads, with Sri Śaṅkara's Commentary, II: Kaṭha and Praśna*, trsl. S. Sitarama Sastri, publ. V.C. Seshacharri, Madras 1928, p. 46.

5. *The Śaiva Upaniṣads*, ed. A. Mahadeva Sastri, Madras: A.L. Ser., 9, 1950, p. 189:
Prāṇān prapīḍyeha saṃyuktaceṣṭaḥ kṣīṇe prāṇe nāsikayocchvasīta /
duṣṭāśvayuktam iva vāham enaṃ vidvān mano dhārayetāpramattaḥ //

6. *The Maitrāyaṇīya Upaniṣad*, ed. J.A.B. van Buitenen (with translation and commentary), The Hague: Mouton 1962 (Disputationes Rheno-Trajectinae, VI), p. 101: *buddhīndriyāṇi khānīmāni / etāny asya raśmayaḥ / karmendriyāṇy asya hayāḥ / rathaṃ śarīram / mano niyantā / prakṛtimayo 'sya pratodaḥ.*
As Van Buitenen, p. 78, remarks, the passage may be an interpolation inspired by the occurrence of *raśmi* "ray" in the preceding sentences.

7. Trsl. Van Buitenen, p. 128. To be precise, the text says that the goad is "made of the material of Prakṛti".

8. *Cetanavat pratiṣṭhāpitam*, rather: "as if it had intelligence".

9. Van Buitenen, p. 104, trsl. p. 131. Text: *atha yaiḥ paripūrṇo 'bhibhūto 'yaṃ rathitaś ca tair vaiva muktas tv ātmann eva sāyujyaṃ bhavati.*

10. *Tad yathānaḥ susamāhitam utsarjaṃ yāyāt, evam evāyaṃ śārīra ātmā prājñenātmanānvārūḍha utsarjaṃ yāti, yatraitad ūrdhvoccvāsī bhavati.* Bṛhad Āraṇyaka Up., with Śaṅkara's Commentary, Gorakhpur ed., [2]2012 V.S., p. 1014.

11. The translation "creaking" for *utsarjam* is proved by some Vedic parallels collected in V.P. Limaye/R.D. Vadekar, *Eighteen Principal Upaniṣads*, Poona: Vaidika Saṃśodhana Maṇḍala, 1958, I, p. 245.

12. MaitrUp. 2,3: *bhagavañ chakaṭam ivācetanam idaṃ śarīram / kasya ... īdṛśo mahimā ... yena ... idaṃ cetanavat pratiṣṭhāpitam / pracodayitāsya kaḥ ....*

13. *Chāgaleya Upaniṣad*, ed. et trad. L. Renou, Paris 1959 ("Les Upaniṣad", 17). Renou's text is as reconstructed by N. Tsuji, *"Ui-Volume"*, Tokyo 1951.

14. *Te ha gṛhītvainān patho 'bhisamīyuḥ / te ha saṃkrīḍata eva kūbariṇo rathacaryām avindan.* For "creaking" as the meaning of *saṃkrīḍataḥ* (Renou: "en grinçant"), Renou follows Tsuji's reference to Patañjali *ad* Pāṇ. 1,3,21 vārttika 1) *saṃkrīḍanti śakaṭāni.*

15. *Taṃ yadāvasāyāśvāṃs takṣāpohyāpāgād atha vyaliṣṭa ...*

16. *Sa yathā pracodayitrāpojjhito neṅgen na ruruvītaivaṃ haiṣa prājñenātmanāpojjhito na brūte na caity api na śvasaty api pūyaty api śvāna upādhavanti ...*

17. *Varaṁ assatarā dantā ājānīyā ca sindhavo /*
kuñjarā ca mahānāgā attadanto tathā varam //

18. *Yo ve uppatitaṁ kodhaṁ rathaṁ bhantaṁ va dhāraye* (v.l. *vāraye*) */*
taṁ ahaṁ sārathiṁ brūmi rasmiggāho itaro jano //

19. The question is discussed by V.N. Toporov, *K voprosy o rekonstruktsii pervonacal'nogo teksta "Dhammapady"* (On the Problem of the Reconstruction of the Original Text of the Dhammapada), in: *Istoriya i kul'tura drevney Indii*, Moskva: Ak. Nauk SSSR, 1963, p. 282-305, on p. 283, 286.

20. Mbh. 11,7,13 (Poona ed.):
Ratham śarīram bhūtānāṃ sattvam āhus tu sārathim /
indriyāṇi hayān āhuḥ karmabuddhiś ca raśmayaḥ //

21. Cf. Mbh. 12,241,1: *Sṛjate tu guṇān sattvaṃ kṣetrajñas tv anutiṣṭhati*, and 12,238,9b *sattve cittaṃ niveśayet*.

22. Mbh. 12,238,2:
Taiś caiṣa kurute kāryaṃ manaḥṣaṣṭhair ihendriyaiḥ /
sudāntair iva saṃyantā dṛḍhaiḥ paramavājibhiḥ //

23. Mbh. 12,240,15:
Teṣāṃ (sc. *indriyāṇāṃ*) *tu manasā raśmīn yadā samyaṅ niyacchati /*
tadā prakāśate hy ātmā ...

24. Mbh. 12,280,1:
Manorathārathaṃ prāpya, indriyārthahayaṃ naraḥ /
raśmibhir jñānasambhūtair yo gacchati sa buddhimān //

25. For the full text we refer to: *The Kubjikāmatatantra (Kulālikāmnāya)*, critically edited by T. Goudriaan and J.A. Schoterman. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1988, p. 458f.

26. *Prasiddhakandharārūḍhaḥ siddhasārathināhataḥ* (KMT 25,7ab). The effect is that the Prasiddha, being smaller, is disproportionately pressed down, a situation which reminds of BṛhĀrUp 4,3,35 (above, n. 10). Instead of *prasiddha-*, six out of ten mss. read *prasiddhaḥ* which might give a meaning "the Prasiddha is mounted on his shoulders". But cf. vs. 23 discussed below.

27. KMT 25,7c-8b:
Sa yāti nīyate yatra parāparanirīkṣaṇāt /
paramāṇusamādiṣṭaḥ karmavṛttau niyāmitaḥ //

28. The Ṣaṭsāhasrasaṃhitā is another text of the Kubjikā school closely related (and presumably secondary) to the Kulālikāmnāya. Cf.: *The Ṣaṭsāhasra Saṃhitā, Chapters 1-5*, ed. and trsl. by J.A. Schoterman. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1982 (Ph.D. Thesis Utrecht). For the present references to this text and its commentary (*Ṭippaṇī*), I am indebted to Dr. Schoterman.

29. Mbh. 12,197,13f.: *udyan hi savitā yadvat ... antarātmā tathā deham āviśyendriyaraśmibhiḥ prāpyendriyaguṇān pañca ... gacchati: praṇītaṃ karmaṇā mārgaṃ nīyamānaḥ ... prāpnoti ... karmaphalam*. Perhaps the author of the KMT was familiar with this text-place.

30. KMT 5,8d. We interpret *arthabhara-* as *arthabhāra-* "load of goods", with metrical shortening not uncommon in the KMT. With *prakṛtyākrāntaśakaṭo*, 9a, cf. Śaṅkara on BṛhĀrUp 4,3,35: *bhārākrāntaḥ*.

31. The text is uncertain: for "break" (*bhajyate*), most mss. read *bhakṣate* or *bhakṣyate* "is consumed". But in 21b, where the same expression *bhajyate mriyate* occurs, only one ms. gives the variant *bhakṣyate*. The "ox" (*gavi*, loc. abs. or loc. pro nom. of a monosyllable?) is likewise found in only a minority of mss., others reading *gati*, *gatiḥ* or *vāpi*, while the Ṣaṭs. gives *vidhiḥ*.

32. One should not think here of the meaning "to creak" for *krīḍ-* attested above in the Chāgaleya Up. (see n. 14).

33. KMT 25.13f.:
Kṣutpipāsābhibhūtas tu caurā gṛhṇanti tatpathe /
kopasaṅgrāmasaṃrambhaṃ striyāliṅganacumbanam //
rājyopadravam etad dhi ...

34. KMT 25,14c: *sārathis tu bhavet tatra vadhyate māryate tu saḥ*. Instead of *bhavet*, given by all mss., an emendation to *bhave* "in that situation" is worth considering. Elsewhere in the KMT we find the expression *bhaviṣyati bhave* "in future circumstances". But perhaps the interpretation should be that rather the Pudgala is killed (being constantly understood as the subject and referred to by means of *saḥ* also elsewhere, e.g. in vs. 21).

35. KMT 25,18:
Yoginīcakramelāpaṃ nṛtyagītaravākulam /
rājyābhiṣekam āpannaṃ chattrotkṣepitacāmaram //
Pāda *d* to be interpreted as: *utkṣepitachattracāmaram*.

36. KMT 25,20-21b:
Atha vātabharākrānto yāti nīyati dūrataḥ /
santrāsitas tu raviṇā (AB *gavinā*, Ṣaṭs. *deveśi*), *viṣamaḥ samaparvatam //*
khañjamāno 'py asau yatnād bhajyate mriyate tu saḥ /

37. KMT 25,23b *prasiddhaskandham āśritaḥ*. Also here, half of the mss. gives *prasiddhaḥ* (see n. 26), which seems impossible in this context. Ṣaṭs.: *prasiddhaskandhasaṃsthitaḥ*.

38. Vs. 23d-24b: ... *parāparavaśānugaḥ / prerito 'sau parātmānā krīḍate sa carācaram*.

39. *Ṣaṭsāhasrasaṃhitāṭippaṇī*, Natl. Archives of Nepal, ms. 5-4775/209, ch. 49.

The doctrine of the Ṣaṭcakra according to the Kubjikāmata

Dory Heilijgers-Seelen

In Tantric and yogic tradition the speculations on the symbolism of the human subtle body and related meditation practices have led to a great diversity, both in number and location, of the mystic centres variously called Cakra, Maṇḍala, Ādhāra, Granthi, etc. They serve as the seat of some particular energy or power forming part of the sonic and/or phenomenal creation.

These centres are found along the central axis of the subtle body. Their number and location depend on the underlying theoretical ideas. There are for example series of five, six, nine, twelve, sixteen or even more centres. They are often merely indicated by the corresponding part of the body, as for instance *nābhi*, *hṛdaya* and *tālu*, without any further details.

The best known system of these centres is that of the six Cakras called Ādhāra or Mūlādhāra, Svādhiṣṭhāna, Maṇipūra, Anāhata, Viśuddhi and Ājñā. The acquaintance with this system is mainly based on rather late Sanskrit texts, such as the Ṣaṭcakranirūpaṇa and the Śivasaṃhitā. They supply us with detailed descriptions of the six Cakras, which represent the system in a developed and rather systematized form: The Cakras are well-defined centres localized at the base of the spine, the genital region, the navel, the heart, the throat and the space between the eyebrows. They are associated with the elements of both the sonic and phenomenal creation, that is, the letters of the Sanskrit alphabet and the ontological entities, the Tattvas. They are to be visualized as lotuses with a varying number of petals which depend on the number of related letters. The geometrical form in a special colour as well as the *bīja-mantra*, both envisaged in the pericarp of the lotus, symbolize the principal Tattvas, namely the five gross elements and mind (*manas*). The Cakras have a presiding deity (Brahmā, etc.) and goddess (Ḍākinī, etc.) and may be associated with various other series of six entities.[1]

An early - if not the first - representation of the concept of the six Cakras is found in the Kubjikāmatatantra (KMT), a Hindu Śākta Tantra of the Kula-tradition from about the tenth century.[2] The text devotes about three hundred verses (chapter 11-13) to the six Cakras. It is not my intention to give a full description of them which would be impossible within the scope of this paper. Besides, many details are still unclear and require further research. Here I want to deal with some features which seem to be essential for this early representation of the Ṣaṭcakra.[3]

Firstly, the Ṣaṭcakra occurs in a twofold variety. The first which is called the *uttara* or northern course, is concerned with creation and related to both Śiva and Śakti. It is also referred to as Kulākula being the combination of Kula (= Śakti) and Akula (= Śiva).[4] The other one is called the *dakṣiṇa* or southern course and regards destruction which is ascribed to Śakti only. It is therefore also defined as Kula.[5]

As they reflect the opposites of creation and destruction one might think that the Ṣaṭcakra in *uttara-* and *dakṣiṇa*-form are just each other's reverse. This means, composed of the same entities, the *uttara* going downwards from Ājñā to Ādhāra, whereas the *dakṣiṇa* follows the order from Ādhāra to Ājñā. This indeed holds good as for their order,[6] but not so with regard to the categories connected with the Cakras. Although both courses concern primarily the elements of sound-manifestation, they do so in a partly different way.

The *uttara-ṣaṭcakra* (KMT 11.16-31) seems to pertain to the successive stages in sound-evolution from its most transcendental stage to the uttered sounds. Issuing from the highest stage (*para*) the first phase is represented by the Viśuddhi. The Viśuddhi is sixteenfold consisting of Śiva and fifteen manifestations of Śakti, viz. the nine subtle stages of sound (*unmanā, samanā, vyāpinī, śakti, bindu, nādānta, nāda, nirodhī* and *ardhacandra*) and six concepts (*ātman, manas, haṃsa, vāyu, nāḍī* and *piṇḍa*).[7] The next stage being the manifestation of the totality of the fifty letters, is represented by the Maṇipūra, the navel-cakra.[8] From there is the creation of ten kinds of "unstruck" sound, related to the Anāhata in the heart-region.[9] Note here the inverted order of the Maṇipūra and the Anāhata. Thereafter follows the manifestation of many sounds[10] which leads in some way to the creation of the Svādhiṣṭhāna in combination with the Ādhāra.[11]

It is in the *dakṣiṇa* variety that the six Cakras occur in a better known sense. The main feature is now the assignment of the letters of the alphabet in its male form, the Śabdarāśi, to the six Cakras. The idea behind this is the mystical identification (*vyāpti*) of parts of the body with the powers of sound. The body is made the seat of these powers which, symbolized as deities, can be worshipped and meditated upon.

The Viśuddhi (KMT 11.44-99ab) is formed by sixteen components denoting the sixteen vowels as well as sixteen concepts which partly also belong to the *uttara*-Viśuddhi. They gradually arise by agitation from the pure body (*viśuddhatanu*) of Śambhu (11.89). The sixteen are: four meditative levels called Rūpātīta, Rūpa, Pada and Piṇḍa,[12] the four Pīṭhas Oḍḍiyāna, Jālandhara, Pūrṇagiri and Kāmarūpa[13] and eight subtle stages of sound-manifestation, viz. *manonmana/unmana, samana, vyāpina, dhvani* or *nādānta*, a fivefold *nāda*,[14] *nairodhika/nirodha*, (*ardha-*)*candra* and

Āditya/Sūrya in the form of *bindu*.[15] The final one, the *bindu*, brings about the creation of the letters (11.88a).

Although the text on the *dakṣiṇa*-Viśuddhi mainly concerns these sixteen concepts, primarily the sixteen vowels seem to be meant.[16] The sixteen components are associated with parts of the body which are located above and in the head.[17]

The Anāhata (KMT 11.99cd-117; 12.1-29) is considered as an eight-petalled lotus situated between the throat and the belly (*kaṇṭhādhastāt kuleśasya udarordhvam avasthitam*, 100ab), by which the heart-region is indicated. This lotus is occupied by ten male deities representing the first ten consonants. They are seated on the eight petals, the knot and the stalk of the lotus. In its centre is the deity Sadāśiva.[18] The ten are associated with different states denoting a special activity or mental disposition which one (the *yogin, ātman* or *haṃsa*) experiences in meditation.[19] Abiding in the centre of the lotus one reaches a perfect state in which one has subdued one's senses and anger. The Anāhata is moreover the seat of the three *guṇas* Sattva, Rajas and Tamas, each of which causes four mental conditions.[20]

The next Cakra, the Maṇipūra (KMT 12.30-69), is formed by the deities who stand for the twelve consonants *ṭa* to *pha*. They are assigned to twelve parts of the body reaching from the belly to the feet, viz. the belly (*udara*), the right and left part of the cavity of the abdomen (*kukṣi*), the navel (*nābhi*), the right and left buttocks (*nitamba*), thighs (*ūru*), knees (*jānu*) and feet (*pāda*).[21] Meditation on the Maṇipūra in its several parts gives special results. For those people who are not capable of this twelvefold meditation (*sādhana*) on the Maṇipūra an alternative is given in the form of a yogic practice called Śaktityāga.[22]

The Svādhiṣṭhāna (KMT 12.70-88; 13.1-36) is described as the Liṅga endowed with six faces (*ṣaṇmukha*, 72a). The deities symbolizing the six consonants *ba* to *la* are appointed to these faces.[23] Other series of six are involved, such as the six bodily substances (*tvac*, etc.) and six Tattvas.[24] In a mythological account it is told how Viṣṇu is installed as the presiding deity of Śiva's Liṅga. Because Viṣṇu made it his seat it is called Svādhiṣṭhāna (... *cakradharaḥ* ... *liṅge svādhiṣṭhito yena, svādhiṣṭhānaṃ tu tena vai*, 13.1).

The lowest Cakra, the Ādhāra (KMT 13.37-52), is here referred to as the Liṅgādhāra (13.37b), the base of the Liṅga. It is also indicated as the womb, the Yoni, of the world being on the pedestal of the Liṅga (*piṇḍikopari liṅgasya, jagadyonir mahāmbike*, 13.38cd). Obviously, the Ādhāra symbolizes the Yoni.[25] The Ādhāra is fourfold referring to the deities who represent the four consonants *va* to *sa*. It is also connected with the

four Pīṭhas Oḍḍiyāna etc. (13.42c), the four Yugas (13.43c) and the four Tattvas Manas, Buddhi, Ahaṃkāra and Prakṛti (ṢSScomm. fol. 99A-B).

Finally, the Ājñā (KMT 13.53-86) which is related to the remaining consonants *ha* and *kṣa*. It is the residence of Śambhu (ṢSScomm. fol. 99B) and particularly concerned with divine knowledge (*śāmbhava-jñāna*, 13.57b) and, as its name indicates, with spiritual authority (*ājñā*) which is twofold. The first is authority by qualification (*adhikāra-ājñā*), which results from knowledge and leads to guruship. The second one, authority by grace (*prasāda-ājñā*), is given by the guru and leads to liberation.[26]

In its main feature, the assignment of the fifty letters in the order sixteen, ten, twelve, six, four and two[27] - a feature which also forms the connecting link between the Cakras - the present system corresponds to the later system with only one minor variation. In the Kubjikāmatatantra the Anāhata is related to ten and the Maṇipūra to twelve consonants, whereas mostly the reverse occurs.[28] The number ten for the Anāhata is perhaps conforming to the ten kinds of "unstruck" sound related to this Cakra in its *uttara* variety. When dealing with the Maṇipūra, the text compares this Cakra with the sun and the twelvefold year and with the calculation of time (12.37-40ab). This may explain the number twelve for this Cakra.

With regard to other aspects, from the brief outline given above it may be evident that the concept of a *cakra* is hardly pronounced here, at least not in the sense of the Cakras as represented in the later system. With the exception of the Anāhata, to which I shall return, they are not viewed as lotuses with a particular number of petals and a special geometrical form visualized in their pericarp.[29] The text itself does not use the terms *cakra* or *ṣaṭcakra* to indicate them.[30]

In this connection we may observe that the Cakras, at least in *dakṣiṇa*-form, are not confined to those parts of the body which are commonly assigned to them, namely the space between the eyebrows, the throat, etc. Although they are associated with those places in one instance (KMT 11.34cd-35), when the separate Cakras are described, the constituents of the Cakras occupy a larger space within the body. As was observed before, the components of the Viśuddhi are localized above and in the head; the Anāhata occupies the space between the throat and the belly; the Maṇipūra in its twelve parts extends from the belly to the feet and the Svādhiṣṭhāna and the Ādhāra symbolize resp. the Liṅga and the Yoni. The location of the Ājñā is not indicated. At the same time emphasis is put on the fact that the Cakras form part of Kuleśa's body, referring to the central male deity.[31]

In this way almost the complete (divine) body is concerned and the Cakras bear evidence of the symbolism of the body as the seat of the

sound-elements. I may refer here to the ritual of *mātṛkā-nyāsa* in which the letters are applied to parts spread all over the body. To some extent the locations given for the components of the Cakras agree with the places indicated for *mātṛkā-nyāsa* according to KMT 17.87-93 and 24.3-20.[32]

Another point concerns the involved meditative practice. It is generally believed that the Ṣaṭcakra is related to the raising of the inner cosmic Śakti, the Kuṇḍalinī, achieved by yogic exercises. From her resting-place, the Ādhāra, she is brought upwards together with the *ātman* along the central *nāḍī*, the Suṣumṇā, through the hierarchy of the Cakras until she reaches union with Śiva in a centre situated above the six Cakras and called the Sahasrāra. By this process the practiser absorbs gradually the elements of the manifested world and realizes his identity with the Supreme.

The Ṣaṭcakra of the Kubjikāmatatantra, however, appears not to be related to this kind of yoga, known as Kuṇḍalinī- or Layayoga. In the context of the six Cakras no reference is made to this Kuṇḍalinī, the Sahasrāra or the Suṣumṇā.[33] In the system of the Kubjikāmatatantra absorption in the Absolute seems not to be the main purpose. Although we do find reference to *mukti* in addition to *bhukti*, the emphasis seems to be put on the latter. A great deal of the text is devoted to the results gained from repeated meditation on the constituents of the Cakras, that is, on the deities representing the sound-energies: For the Viśuddhi are mentioned sixteen states which are perceptible (*pratyakṣa*), such as a flow of tears and the thrilling of the hair (KMT 11.94cd-98ab). Concentration on the Anāhata brings about different mental states (11.103-106, see note 19). The effects of meditation on the Maṇipūra (12.41-53ab), the Svādhiṣṭhāna (13.9-28) and the Ādhāra (13.44-52) mainly pertain to magical and supernatural powers and the supremacy over various kinds of spirits like Bhūtas, Vetālas, Guhyakas and so on. The Ājñā concerns a twofold meditation. One consists of the application of Vāgeśvarī's Mantra and results in control of speech (*vāgīśatva*, 13.61) and omniscience (*sarvajña-tva*, 13.53d).[34] The second form of meditation is without the use of a Mantra (*bījavarjita*, 13.77d) or any other means (*sarvopāyavihīna*, 13.79c) and leads to bliss (13.77cd-86).

Finally, I want to make a few notes on some of the Cakras. As has been observed before, the Anāhata is the only Cakra considered as a lotus. Being an eight-petalled lotus which is the seat of the *haṃsa* or *jīva*, the individual *ātman* who experiences various mental states when abiding on the petals, the Anāhata reflects the traditional concept of the heart-lotus. Similar descriptions of this lotus, not forming part of the Ṣaṭcakra, occur frequently in other sources as e.g. in Dhyānabindu-

Upaniṣad 94 (*ātmanirṇaya*) and the Haṃsopaniṣad.[35] The latter mentions also ten kinds of "unstruck" sound. This heart-lotus might be connected with for instance the eight Mothers (Brahmāṇī, etc.) and the elements of the Puryaṣṭaka (the *tanmātras*, *manas*, *ahaṃkāra* and *buddhi*).[36] Seemingly, this concept prevailed in the case of the Anāhata in the Kubjikāmatatantra and made it necessary to locate two of the ten deities on the knot and the stalk of the lotus, as only eight petals were available.

Another remark concerns the two lower Cakras, the Svādhiṣṭhāna and the Ādhāra. Symbolizing the Liṅga and the Yoni or base of the Liṅga, they show a close connection to each other and presumably allude to creation.[37] The description of the Svādhiṣṭhāna includes a creation-myth relating how before creation only Śiva existed in Liṅga-form. On his wish creation was brought forth and, worshipped by Brahmā, Viṣṇu and other gods, He fixed himself as a hexagon and square (*ṣaḍaśraṃ caturaśraṃ tu, ātmānaṃ ca samarpitam*, 12.75ab) which could refer to the Svādhiṣṭhāna and the Ādhāra (12.71-75). In this connection I may refer to another series of Cakras, five in number and dealt with in the subsequent chapters of the Kubjikāmatatantra (ch. 14-16). The lowest centre of this series is composed of goddesses called Devīs and comprises both the Svādhiṣṭhāna and the Ādhāra. Combined they symbolize the ontological entities, the Tattvas, and the bodily substances, the *dhātus*, which bind the *ātman* to its worldly existence. The description of this centre is mixed up with speculations on embryology and cosmogony.[38]

I have referred to some aspects of the Ṣaṭcakra as taught in the Kubjikāmatatantra: the *uttara-* and *dakṣiṇa*-variety, its preoccupation with the elements of sound, the location of the Cakras and, at least in this context, the absence of Kuṇḍalinī-yoga. Referring to the six Cakras, Sanderson recently (1986: 164f) observed that it is a.o. the Ṣaṭcakra which characterizes the Kubjikā- and the later Kula-tradition as being distinguished from the adjacent Krama- and Trika-traditions. This underlines the relevance of the early representation by the Kubjikāmatatantra of a system of Cakras that later on became so widespread.

Notes

1. See e.g. ṢCN 1ff, translation with introduction in Avalon 1964[7]; ŚS 5.56-101, cf. Gupta e.a. 1979: 172ff.

The six Cakras may form part of other series. E.g. YH 1.25-26 and 2.8 mention nine Cakras, adding a thousand-petalled lotus below the Ādhāra, Lambikā below and Lalāṭa above the Ājñā. Cf. VR 1.52 with comm. See also Nowotny 1958: 33ff.

2. For the KMT and other texts of the Kubjikā tradition (the Paścimāmnāya) see Goudriaan-Gupta 1981: 52ff. The critical edition of the KMT by T. Goudriaan and J.A. Schoterman has been published early in 1988.

3. For this paper I mainly confined myself to the text of the KMT itself and a commentary on the KMT called Kubjikāmatalaghuṭipya (KMTcomm.). In some instances I consulted the parallel versions of the KMT: the Ṣaṭsāhasrasaṃhitā (ṢSS; I want to thank J.A. Schoterman who kindly gave me his transcription of ṢSS ms.nr.5-428/54) with a commentary called the Ṣaṭsāhasraṭippanī (ṢSScomm.) and the Gorakṣasaṃhitā (GS). Both the ṢSS and the GS contain almost all the verses of KMT ch. 11-13.

It is noteworthy that, while the ṢSS furnishes additional material on many subjects dealt with in the KMT, the section on the six Cakras (ṢSS ch. 18-ch. 19.114) is rather reserved in this respect. For the mutual relation between the KMT and the ṢSS in general, see Schoterman 1982: 12ff.

On the other hand, the section of the GS dealing with the six Cakras (GS ch. 15-ch. 16.236) is almost twice as long as that of the KMT and counts about 543 verses. It appears that the lines of chapter 15 and 16.1-236 have changed place. Chapter 15 deals with the Svādhiṣṭhāna, the Ādhāra and the Ājñā, whereas 16.1-236 discuss the Viśuddhi, the Anāhata and the Maṇipūra. Comparison with KMT ch. 11-13 indicates that the lines numbered as GS 16.1-236 ought to precede those of chapter 15.

4. KMT 11.31cd (*kulākulam idaṃ ṣaṭkam, uttaraṃ te prakāśitam*) and 11.33cd (*sṛṣṭimārgakramāyātaṃ, śivaśakteḥ kulākulam*).

5. KMT 11.34ab (*saṃhārapadaṣaṭkasya, kulaṃ śaktyāntadakṣiṇam*).

6. ṢSScomm. fol. 88A and KMTcomm. fol.34B (*ājñāta ārabhya yaḥ sṛṣṭikramaḥ sa śivaśaktyātmakaḥ kulākulasvarūpaḥ*). Or, indicating the central position of the Ājñā, the *uttara*-order of the six Cakras is found as Viśuddhi, Anāhata, Maṇipūra, Svādhiṣṭhāna, Ādhāra and Ājñā; the *dakṣiṇa*, following the reverse order, starts then with the Ājñā. See KMT 11.33ab (*tatra tad dakṣiṇaṃ ṣaṭkam, ājñāpūrvaṃ kulodbhavam*) and ṢSScomm. fol.88B. But see also note 27.

7. See ṢSScomm. fol.84A; the first four, *unmanā* etc., belong to Icchāśakti, the next five to Jñāna-śakti and the six to Kriyā-śakti. For the subtle stages of sound-evolution, see Padoux 1975: 82ff, referring to texts of the Trika tradition such as the Netra Tantra, the Svacchandatantra and the Tantrāloka. According to those texts the *bindu* comes after the *ardhacandra*, whereas here (ṢSScomm.) the *bindu* is placed between *śakti* and *nādānta*. The last three stages (*ma, u* and *a*) are omitted because it does not concern here the Mantra *Oṃ*.

The KMT itself is rather obscure on the sixteen components of the *uttara*-Viśuddhi. More or less the same sixteen entities as enumerated by the ṢSScomm. are mentioned in the initial part of KMT ch.11. This may mean that the description of the *uttara-ṣaṭcakra* starts at the beginning of ch. 11.

8. KMT 11.17cd-21ab. According to the ṢSScomm. fol.105B-106A the fifty letters move from the Maṇipūra upwards and downwards to the other Cakras.

9. KMT 11.21cd-27ab. The ten kinds of "unstruck" sound are called (KMT 11.22-24): the onomatopoetic sounds *ciṇī* and *ciñciṇī*, the sound of a cricket (*cīra*), of a conch-shell (*śaṅkha*), of the string of a lute (*tantri*), of the bamboo-cane (*vaṃśa*), the rattling (?, *tāla*) of a metal vessel (*kaṃsa*), the sound of a cloud (*megha*), of burning (*dāgha*) and the sound of a kettle-drum (*dundubhi*).

10. The text reads *kṣobhayitvā navān bahūn* in 11.27d. Considering the context we perhaps should read *kṣobhayitvā ravān bahūn*, although this reading is found in one manuscript only (ms.F).

11. KMT 11.28ab-29ab (*svādhiṣṭhānaṃ vinirmitam ... ādhāraṃ brahmaṇas tu tat*). The proposed interpretation of the *uttara* Ṣaṭcakra is however rather tentative. Especially the meaning of the Svādhiṣṭhāna, the Ādhāra and the Ājñā is not clear.

12. KMT 11.48. These levels are elaborately discussed in KMT ch. 17-19.

13. KMT 11.49cd. The four Pīṭhas are described in the next lines (11.50-73) as situated on the Kailāsa.

14. The five *nādas* are called: subtle, very subtle, manifested, unmanifested and artificial (*sūkṣmaś caiva susūkṣmaś ca, vyaktāvyakto 'tha kṛtrimaḥ*, 11.80ab).

15. KMT 11.74-88. In this series of subtle sound-stages, *śakti* is omitted after *vyāpina*, probably because only eight stages were required. Cf. the *uttara*-Viśuddhi counting nine stages. The ṢSS (18.99cd) however inserts *bindu* = Kuṇḍalinī Śakti after *vyāpina*. Contrary to the series of the *uttara*-Viśuddhi the *bindu* is now found after *ardhacandra*, cf. note 7.

16. Cf. ṢSScomm. fol.89A: *ṣoḍaśasvarā dakṣiṇamārgeṇa jñātavyāḥ*. The KMT refers only to the vowels *ḷ* and *ḹ*, identified with *unmana* and *samana* (11.74-75).

17. KMT 11.90-93. The first four (Piṇḍa etc.) belong to the body of He who exceeds Kula (=Akula), the other twelve belong to Kula and are localized in the head (*kulātītaśarīrasya, piṇḍam ādyaṃ catuṣkalam / dvādaśāṅgaṃ kuleśasya, mastake saṃvyavasthitam*, 11.90). The next three verses give some further details.

18. KMT 11.100cd-102ab. The consonants related to the Anāhata as well as to the other Cakras are symbolized by male deities. For their names and the letters they represent, see Schoterman 1982: 218f.

19. The ten states are mentioned in the lines 11.103-106; they are a.o. royal play (*rājyakrīḍā*), distress (*udvega*; read *athodvegam* instead of *athordhve ca* in 11.103a, as found in KMT mss AB, ṢSS 18.127c and GS 16.132c), destruction (*saṃhāra*), desire (*abhilāṣa*) and detachment (*vairāgya*).

20. KMT 11.111-117. In 12.1-29 the different marks (*lakṣaṇa*) of these states are enumerated.

21. KMT 12.33-36. In the enumeration in 12.31cd (*nābhyudaranitamborujaṅghāṅghrīm anukramāt*) the right and left *kukṣi* are omitted and the knees are replaced by the shanks (*jaṅgha*); *pāda* d has only seven syllables. Cf. ṢSS 18.174b (*jaṅghā hy antam anukramāt*) and GS 16.181d (*jaṅghoru tanutatkramāt*).

22. KMT 12.53cd-67ab; cf. ṢSScomm. fol.96A: *athavā [dvā]daśadhāsādhane aśaktaḥ tadā śakti-tyāgaṃ kāryam*.

23. Or rather, to five faces (*uttara-*, *ūrdhva-*, *pūrva-*, *dakṣiṇa-* and *paścima-vaktra*) and the body (*deha*), 12.81-84ab. Cf. 12.86a: *pañcavaktratanūdbhūtaṃ ... rūpam*. The six deities are moreover associated with six parts (of the Liṅga?) (13.7-8): *tanu, māyāsthāna* (= *lambikā*, GS 15.99c), *mukhāgra* (= *rājadanta*, GS 15.99d), *randhra* (= *nāsikāmadhya*, GS 15.100a), *maṇimastaka* (= *bhrūmadhya*, GS 15.100b) and *sīmanī*.

24. The six Tattvas are (KMT 12.83-85; 13.2-3): *māyā, śambhu, puruṣa, rāga* (in 13.3a, but *nāgarūpam* in 12.83d; cf. *rāgarūpam* in KMT ms C and ṢSS 18.227d), *nivṛtti/niyati* and *avidyā*. The KMTcomm. mentions *kāla* instead of *avidyā* (fol.39B-40A).

25. Cf. also KMTcomm. fol.41A (... *svādhiṣṭhānaliṅgasya pīṭhikārūpaḥ ādhāraḥ*) and ṢSScomm. fol.99A (... *svādhiṣṭhānaliṅgasya pīṭhikā ... iti piṇḍikā / sā eva yoniḥ / ubhau śivaśaktyau / liṅgayonī /*).

26. For the twofold Ājñā, see KMT 13.54ff. and also 3.107ff.

27. Although the six Cakras are described here in the *dakṣiṇa*-variety they are yet mentioned in the order from Viśuddhi to Ājñā indicating the *uttara*-variety. Cf. note 6. For the *dakṣiṇa*-variety as characterized by the letters see ṢSScomm. fol.105B (*evaṃ varṇasaṃpradāyagatyā dakṣiṇaṃ ṣaṭcakram*).

28. Cf. Nowotny (1958: 60): "Wenn das eine 12 Ecken hat, hat das andere 10, und umgekehrt". For a twelvefold navel-*cakra* she refers to Dhyānabindu-Upan. 49-50 (... *maṇipūrakam / dvādaśāramahācakre* ...) and Triśikhibrāhmaṇa-Upan. 58f. (...*nābhir* ... *tatra cakraṃ dvādaśāraṃ*).

29. As the base of the Liṅga, the Ādhāra is depicted as a geometrical figure, but not as lotus. See KMT 13.37cd-38ab (*vṛttākāraṃ sarandhraṃ tu, caturasraṃ prakīrtitam // trirandhravalayākāraṃ, śṛṅgāṭākṛtivarcasam*) referring to a circle, a square and a triangle. Slightly different figures are found in GS 15.162 and ṢSS 19.36.

30. However, the Anāhata is circumscribed as *daśadhāvasthite cakre* (KMT 11.109a) and the separate parts of the Maṇipūra are called *cakras* (*ekaikaṃ cintayec cakraṃ*, 12.41a; *kukṣimārgagate cakre*, 12.49c and *madhyanābhigate cakre*, 12.51a).

As a collective term either *ṣaṭka* or *ṣaṭpadārtha* (e.g. KMT 11.2 and 14.1) is used; but also *ṣaṭcakra* in ṢSS (e.g. 9.1ff.) and *ṣaṭpada* (GS 15.209).

The GS describes different Cakras for the deities of the Svādhiṣṭhāna and the Ādhāra: The six deities of the Svādhiṣṭhāna are to be meditated upon in six Cakras, called the Māyā-cakra, the Mukha-cakra, the Randhra-cakra, the Maṇicakra, the Sīmanyordhvagata-cakra and the Brahmādhāra. Except for the final one they are furnished with twelve or sixteen spokes/petals, occupied by twelve or sixteen female deities (GS 15.102-148). Likewise, the deities of the Ādhāra are placed in four similar Cakras (GS 15.169ff.).

31. For the Viśuddhi belonging to both Akula and Kula see note 17 and KMT 11.94ab (*akuleśakuleśānaṃ, vibhajya ca niveśitam*). For the Anāhata etc., see 11.99-100 (... *anāhatam // kaṇṭhādhastāt kuleśasya, udarordhvam avasthitam*), 12.32ab (*kulanāthamaheśasya, saṃsthito maṇipūrakaḥ*), 13.31a (*etat kuleśvaraṃ liṅgam*) and 13.37ab (*śrīkuleśvaradevasya, liṅgādhāraṃ* ...).

32. *Mātṛkā-nyāsa* is twofold: *antarmātṛkā-nyāsa* in the six Cakras and *bāhyamātṛkā-nyāsa* externally on the body (Jhavery 1944: 80). Cf. also Agastyasaṃhitā 12.8-10 referred to by Bakker (1986: 94): *mātṛkā-nyāsa* on six lotuses with resp. four, six, ten, twelve, sixteen and two petals, localised in the feet (*pāda*), *guhya*, *nābhi*, *hṛd*, *kaṇṭha* and *bhrūmadhya*. Note here the location of the four-petalled lotus (= Ādhāra).

33. Neither to Prāṇa which according to most Upaniṣads goes upwards through the Suṣumṇā instead of the Kuṇḍalinī (Nowotny 1958: 9; Haṃsopaniṣad). It should be noted that the raising of the Kuṇḍalinī Śakti does occur in a different context in the KMT, namely in *mantra-uccāra* or *śakty-uccāra*, a method to make a Mantra effective (KMT 4.17-28).

34. KMT 13.69-77ab. This meditation concerns the letter *ha*. The Mantra of (Kula)vāgeśvarī is Calamakūle (13.69-70ab) and has to be applied in the form of twelve ślokas to twelve parts of the body (13.72cd). The ślokas run as follows (13.70cd-71; ṢSScomm. fol.100Bff.): *aiṃ calamakūle a haḥ, aiṃ calamakūle ā haḥ / aiṃ calamakūle i haḥ, aiṃ calamakūle ī haḥ*, etc. So, the twelve *ślokas* together contain the 48 letters from *a* to *sa*; the letter *ha* is found in each *pāda*. The twelve locations in the body are partly different according to the ṢSScomm., the KMTcomm. and the GS. The latter (GS 15.216ff.) indicates them as *kodaṇḍadvayamadhya, nāsāgra, vaktra, kaṇṭhakūpa, hṛd, nābhi, ādhāra, meḍhra, liṅga, ūru, jānu* and *pāda*.

35. Cf. Nowotny 1958: 59f.

36. See for instance Abhinavagupta in his Dehasthadevatācakrastotra 6ff: the eight Mothers are identified with Buddhi, Ahaṃkṛti, Manas and the five organs of perception. In KRP fol.58Bff. the eight petals of the heart-lotus are associated with the five subtle elements (*śabda* etc.), Manas, Ahaṃkāra and Buddhi. The *haṃsa* moves about on the eight petals, shares thereby the state of *śabda* etc.

37. Cf. Hoisington 1854: 234: the two lower Cakras "are sometimes combined, when considered as the seat or dominion of Brahmā, the Generator". Unfortunately, he does not refer to any text.

38. A study on these five Cakras is in preparation.

Abbreviations and bibliography

GS — Gorakṣasaṃhitā (part 1), ed. by Janārdana Pāṇḍeya. Varanasi, 1976 (Sarasvatī Bhavana Granthamālā, 110).

KMT — Kubjikāmatatantra, the preliminary critical text by T. Goudriaan and J.A. Schoterman, published early in 1988 by Brill, Leiden.

KMTcomm. — Kubjikāmatalaghuṭipya, Ms. nr.34, Kaisar Library, Kathmandu.

KRP — Kulamūlaratnapañcakāvatāra, Ms. A 1552, Nat. Archives, Kathmandu.

ṢCN — Ṣaṭcakranirūpaṇa, see Avalon 1964[7].

ṢSS — Ṣaṭsāhasrasaṃhitā, Ms. nr.5-428/54, Nat. Archives, Kathmandu.

ṢSScomm. — Ṣaṭsāhasraṭippanī, Ms. nr.1-30/300, Nat. Archives, Kathmandu.

ŚS Śivasaṃhitā, ed. by K.R. Śrīkṛṣṇadās. Bombay 1960.

VR Varivasyā-rahasya by Bhāskararāya, ed. and transl. by Subrahmanya Sastri, repr. Adyar, 1948 (Adyar Library Series, 28).

YH Yoginīhṛdaya, with commentaries Dīpikā of Amṛtānanda and Setubandha of Bhāskararāya, ed. by Gopināth Kavirāj, 2nd ed. Varanasi 1963 (Sarasvatī Bhavana Granthamālā, 7).

Abhinavagupta, Dehasthadevatācakrastotra, ed. by K.C. Pandey in: Abhinavagupta, an historical and philosophical study, 2nd ed. Varanasi, 1963, p.952-953.

Avalon, Arthur 1964[7]. The Serpent Power: being the Ṣaṭcakra-nirūpaṇa and Pādukā-pañcaka, text and translation with introduction and commentary. Madras (repr. New York, 1974).

Bakker, Hans 1986. Ayodhyā. Groningen (Groningen Oriental Studies, 1).

Goudriaan, Teun and Sanjukta Gupta 1981. Hindu Tantric and Śākta Literature. Wiesbaden (A History of Indian Literature, II, 2).

Gupta, Sanjukta, Dirk Jan Hoens and Teun Goudriaan 1979. Hindu Tantrism. Leiden/Köln (Handbuch der Orientalistik, 2. Abt.: Indien, 4. Band, 2. Abschnitt).

Hoisington, H.R. 1854. "Siva-Pirakāsam, Light of Sivan, a metaphysical and theological treatise, transl. from the Tamil", Journal of the American Oriental Society, vol. 4, 125-244.

Jhavery, M.B. 1944. Comparative and Critical Study of Mantrasastra. Ahmedabad.

Nowotny, Fausta 1958. Eine durch Miniaturen erläuterte Doctrina Mystica aus Srinagar. 's-Gravenhage (Indo-Iranian Monographs, 3).

Padoux, André 1975. Recherches sur la symbolique et l'énergie de la parole dans certains textes tantriques. Paris (Publ. de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne, 21).

Sanderson, A. 1986. Discussion on "Kubjikā's Samayamantra and its manipulation in the Kubjikāmata", by Teun Goudriaan, in: Mantras et Diagrammes Rituels dans l'Hindouisme, ed. by A. Padoux, Paris 1984.

Schoterman, J.A. 1982. The Ṣaṭsāhasra Saṃhitā, Chapters 1-5, ed., transl. and annotated. Leiden (Orientalia Rheno-Trajectina, 27).

The body in tantric ritual: the case of the mudrās

André Padoux

In all rituals the performer must make some prescribed gestures. The body therefore plays a role in ritual. If, as happens frequently in Tantric hinduism, a rite is "interiorized", it is deemed to take place, or to produce effects, in the body, so that in such cases also the body plays a part in the ritual process, either through prescribed bodily postures (*āsana*), or because of the "inner" experiences supposed to take place in the mind or in the "subtle body" of the performer. One knows also that in the saiddhāntikāgamas as well as in the bhairavāgamas and in many tantras, yoga (which is bodily *cum* mental technique) is considered an integral part of *pūjā* and of many other rites.

In this respect, *mudrā*s appear in ritual as actions which combine bodily postures or gestures and mental or spiritual elements: as bodily actions which at the same time are moments of religious and/or mystical experience. I would like to quote here a few Tantric texts on the subject of *mudrā* chosen from among those of the Kaula tradition, where the dual nature of *mudrā*s is especially noticeable. It goes without saying that a more throrough study of the case of *mudrā*s would show numerous instances, perhaps a majority, where *mudrā*s are either mere hand gestures or bodily movements only, or, conversely, spiritual attitudes or divinities only. Here however I shall confine myself to those cases where they have a dual aspect since in my opinion these best illustrate the range of the *mudrā*s' possible meanings and uses.

The few texts I shall quote are all śaiva, or "śāktaśaiva" works. They are all "kashmirian", in the sense that they are of the Kaula *śivādvaita* or *saṃvidadvaya* tradition as it existed either in Kashmir or in South India among those śaiva authors who looked to Kashmir as the source of their tradition. With the exception of Abhinavagupta's (Abh) Tantrāloka (TĀ), these works cannot be dated. They can however be held to have been composed between, say, the 10th and 14th centuries A.D.

I shall begin with the *mudrā*s described in two different but related texts of the Kaula *dakṣiṇāmnāya* tradition of Tripurā (Traipuradarśana, or Śrīvidyā, as it is also called): the Vāmakeśvarīmatatantra (VMT) or Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava (NṢA), and the Yoginīhṛdaya (YH). The first work was commented upon by Jayaratha (J) and Śivānanda (*circa* 13th century), the latter by Amṛtānanda (13-14th century).

These two texts describe nine or ten *mudrā*s, which are, first, deities either pervading the whole *śrīcakra* or residing each in each of its nine constituent parts (*cakras* or *āvaraṇa*s). The *mudrā*s are also hand-gestures

symbolizing these deities, gestures the *sādhaka* is to make when placing, by *nyāsa*, these deities in their proper places in the *śrīcakra*. The *mudrā*s appear thus as ten different aspects of the main deity, Tripurasundarī, present in the diagram which symbolizes her, or, more exactly, which is her cosmic form. In addition, in so far as the *mudrā*s are aspects of the deity present in the *śrīcakra*, on and with which the *pūjā* is made, and in so far as the *sādhaka*, to perform the *pūjā*, must be first identified with the deity he worships, these *mudrā*s also express spiritual attitudes, forms of the inner participation, by the performer of the ritual, in the cosmic play of the Goddess he is worshipping.

This threefold aspect of *mudrā*s is not visible in the VMT/NṢA. This text, indeed, in its first *paṭala*, after having conveyed how to draw the *śrīcakra* and described the deities to be worshipped thereon, says only (MVT, 1.164-5, NṢA, 1.184) how to place the nine *mudrā*s, Samkṣobhana, etc. Further on, in the 28 *śloka*s of *paṭala* 3, the text describes the same nine *mudrā*s, that is, it describes the hand-poses which constitute them and tells their names and their effects. *Mudrā*s appear thus as effect-producing ritual gestures: with his body, the adept performs a symbolical ritual action. The text simply states that the *mudrā*s of Tripurasundarī are to be displayed in the prescribed order during the time of the *pūjā*: *pūjākāle prayoktavyā yathānukramayogataḥ* (*śl.* 28). In his commentary, J (following in fact Svacchandatantra, 14.20) explains *yathānukrama* as meaning: at the beginning of the rite, during it, and when the deity is dismissed - a notion we shall meet again, more interestingly, in a passage of Abh's TĀ (also commented on by J). In his Vivaraṇa on those 28 *śloka*s of VMT, however, J gives no symbolical or spiritual interpretation of the *mudrā*s. He does not even comment on their effects, which are in fact mainly magical: they bestow on the performer of the ritual play various supernatural powers and make the Goddess favorably disposed towards the *sādhaka*, who will succeed in all his endavours (they are *sarvārthasiddhidāḥ*).

The same nine *mudrā*s, plus a tenth (or more exactly a first) one - ten in all - are set forth in the same order (which is not arbitrary) in the first *paṭala* of the YH (*śl.* 57-71) dealing with the *śrīcakra*. The *mudrā*s, as deities, naturally are in the same places in the diagram as in the VMT/NṢA, but they are expounded in an entirely different manner: the YH does not describe the hand poses, only the cosmic or metaphysical significance of the *mudrā*s. These appear here as ten different aspects of the Goddess's energy of activity (*kriyāśakti*), seen from the point of view of the cosmic process of resorption: they are ten stages, or forms, of this process. Here the true significance of the *mudrā*s in YH already

appears: they are bodily gestures as well as mystical attitudes corresponding to particular stages of spiritual life: therefore they are also stages or aspects of the process of the performing adept's identification with the deity.

Kriyāśakti, says YH, 1.57, is called *mudrā* because it gladdens the universe and causes it to flow or expand: *kriyāśaktis tu viśvasya modanād drāvaṇāt tathā / mudrākhyā* ... .[1] As the Mother, Ambikā, this energy first pervades the whole *cakra*, or more precisely its three parts, and thus causes the Devī to abide there eternally: it is the first *mudrā*, Trikhandā. Once present in the *śrīcakra, kriyāśakti* evolves. Linked now with Vāmā, she "agitates" the whole cosmos: she is Sarvasaṃkṣobhiṇī. Then, with the goddess Jyeṣṭhā, she protects the universe and bestows grace upon it, making it flow (she is *sarvavidrāviṇī*) and since she bestows grace on all beings, she attracts them to her and is thus the *mudrā* Sarvākarṣaṇī. *Kriyāśakti* then becomes Sarvāveśakarī by producing the absorption (*āveśa*) in Śiva/Śakti. Since this mystical union inebriates or maddens the adept, she is the *mudrā* Sarvonmādinī. After this, vomiting the cosmos but also detaining it, she is the Mahāṅkuśa *-mudrā*, the great Goad. This is followed by the *mudrā* Khecarī, destroyer of all imperfections, i.e. of all differentiation (*vikalpa*): *mudrā* and adept are now in the "sky of consciousness", hence her name. After this the Bījamudrā appears, germ of the whole cosmos, issuing from Śiva and Śakti's embrace, and finally, in the *bindu* of the *śrīcakra*, at its very centre, is to be found the Yonimudrā, the cosmic matrix, the creative cosmic dynamism of the Goddess and her full bliss: *yoni* is the place both of creation and of bliss. The succession of the ten *mudrā*s thus represents a process which is both cosmic (that of the deity flowing back into herself) and mystical, since these *mudrā*s also symbolise - or, more exactly, *are* moments, stages, aspects of the dynamic process of the *sādhaka*'s fusion with the deity he worships in the diagram: mystical union and ritual process are inseparable. But the ritual action which takes place is thus also a bodily one: the performer of the ritual, whilst he invokes each of the *mudrā*s, which are both divine forms and spiritual attitudes, must "display the *mudrā*", i.e. execute the hand-gesture which represents, nay, which *is* the divine form. Simultaneously he must visualize, by *dhyāna* or *bhāvanā*, a "form" of the *mudrā* as residing in the *śrīcakra* in front of him and on which he is doing the *pūjā*, and also, still more important, he must imagine the *mudrā*s as being in the centers of his subtle body along the path of the *kuṇḍalinī*. The whole process thus takes place, at least in theory, on several planes: divine-cosmic, corporal-mental and ritual: the rite brings into play, through thought and bodily action, a cosmic, mental and corporeal totality.

This complexity, this holistic nature, of *mudrā*s is underscored in Amṛtānanda's Dīpikā on YH: he explains the *mudrā*s in terms which do not separate the bodily gesture and its cosmic meaning. The two are dealt with together in the same sentence as if they were the same thing, or, to put it differently, as if they were two faces of the same indissoluble reality.

Let us, for instance, take the case of the *mudrā* Sarvāveśakarī which YH, 1.62-3 describes thus: "That which resides between two *vyoman* as the *bindu* is known as producing an absorption into the divine resulting from the embrace of Śiva and Śakti. She is a form of the bliss of consciousness and is in the *cakra* of 14 triangles".[2] The *mudrā*, one notes, may be found "physically" in the *cakra*, but its description by YH is a strictly metaphysical one. Now, Amṛtānanda (p. 80-81)[3] adds one more dimension since he first explains that there are five *vyoman*, subtle centers of energy situated along the *suṣumnā*, between the six *cakra*s from *mūlādhāra* to *ājñā*, and that between these two series of centers there are five *bindu*s,[4] each of which is identified with one of the five *mahābhūta*s: the elements composing the world and the body. He then adds: "'resulting from the embrace of Śiva and Śakti' [means that] the fingers of the right hand are Śiva (*śivātmānaḥ*). Those of the left hand are Sakti (*śaktyātmānaḥ*). This *mudrā* being formed by the interlacing of the fingers of the two hands possessing [respectively] the natures of Śiva and Śakti, which thus compress, squeeze, all that is between them is *'divyāveśakarī'*: it causes the possession by, the total fusion with (*āveśa*, *sāmarasya*), the divine, i.e. with Śiva whose nature is light [of consciousness] (*prakāśātmaśiva*). This *mudrā* is in the *cakra* of 14 triangles called Sarvasaubhāgyadāyaka. She is energy of consciousness (*saṃvicchakti*), a form of bliss (or: her form is bliss - *ānandavigrahaḥ*). Her inner nature (*svarūpa*) is that of total fusion with the supreme Śiva (*paraśivasāmarasyarūpiṇī*). What does this mean? - It means that the nature of the *mudrā* is that of a joining (*bandhana*) [of the hands] indicating the total fusion of the pair Śiva/Śakti, made of the five *bindu*s formed by the five fingers of each hand placed between those of the other hand. Thus made of the bliss of total fusion in Consciousness, this *mudrā* dwells in the *cakra* of 14 triangles."

We have here, I believe, a very typical example of the complex and ambiguous conception, in such texts, of the nature of *mudrā*s: they are at the same time deities, spiritual experiences linked to the structure of the subtle body (and thus forms of *kuṇḍalinī*-yoga), aspects or stages in the ritual, and finally hand-gestures symbolizing all this - symbolizing in the strongest sense of the term, since the spiritual experience which the

mudrā expresses, and its cosmic symbolism, must, at least in theory, be shared by the performer of the ritual. The question of course remains as to whether a real mystical experience does take place, or if it is simply imagined, or acted out. But, whatever the actual case, the experience is described in the texts as real.

The complexity of *mudrā*s is also described, not synthetically as it is here, but analytically, by Śivānanda in his Ṛjuvimarśinī on NṢA, 3.22-3 (p. 184-186). Explaining the Khecarimudrā, he says that according to some it is a finger-pose, *aṅgulivicaraṇa*. According to others it cannot be described, since its nature is to have as its fruit the moving in the sky of consciousness (*bodhagaganacaritā kācit phalātmā na vyākhyānārhā*): it is a mystical experience. According to others still, it pertains to yoga, since it is a bodily posture: *yogātmā saṃsthāna viśeṣānusārarūpā*. To illustrate his point, Ś. then quotes three texts, among which is the Mālinīvijayottaratantra, 7.15-17.

The whole chapter of this last text (one of the older Kaula works of the Trika) is made up of descriptions of *mudrā*s, which are bodily gestures and postures accompanied by the *uccāra* of mantras. The Khecarīmudrā described in the passage quoted by Śivānanda is a yogic practice, since the yogin, in *padmāsana*, is to place (by *nyāsa*) the "Lord of the Senses" (Akṣeśvara) in the *cakra* of the navel, then guide it up through three "voids" (*khatrayam*) and then thrust it through three other such "voids".[5]

As was to be expected, it is in the TĀ (*āhnika* 32) of Abh. (and in J's commentary thereon) that we find the most elaborate (though still very brief) attempt at defining the nature and scope of *mudrā*s in the bhairavāgamic context. The 67 *śloka*s of this chapter are devoted to *mudrā*s. It describes, in fact, only a few variants of one *mudrā*: the Khecarī. Enough is said there however to show Abh's position on the subject - a position which reflects that of older bhairavāgamas, to which he refers.

*Mudrā*s, he says (*śl.*9-10) can be of four sorts: done with the body, the hands, speech, or the mind: *mudrā caturvidhā kāyakaravākcitta-bhedataḥ*. J explains by quoting a text according to which a *mudrā* can be *karajā*, created by the hand: a hand-gesture; or *kāyikī*, i.e. postures or movements of the body; or it may consist in maintaining a state of identity with a mantra (*mantratanmayatā mudrā vilāpyākhyā*). Finally, if the *mudrā* is of a mental kind, it consists in a state of identification with the deity which is visualized or meditated upon (*dhyeyatanmayatā mudrā mānasī parikīrtitā*).

The third of these categories is somewhat problematical: it consists, says J (id. p. 308), in *mantravilāpa*, enunciation of a mantra. This makes it difficult to distinguish it from *mantroccāra* or *japa*. (In fact, later on, *śl.*49, he expressely states that the *vācika* Khecarimudrā is done *uccāreṇa*.) The fourth sort would tend to show that a *mudrā* can be purely mental. As appears however from *śl.*51-2 and J's commentary thereon, the *mānasi* Khecarimudrā is a mental effort coupled with the *uccāra* of a mantra. It might perhaps also consist in visualizing a posture, or, more likely, in evoking mentally the form and the *mudrā*s of a deity, together with other yogic *bhāvanā* and the utterance of mantras, something akin, in short, to what we have seen in YH and Dī. In the case which Abh considers in the following *śloka*s of *āh.*32, where he describes a different types of Khecarī, the four elements are combined, the total effect being "to cause the presence of the deity" (it is done *devīsannidhaye*) wherever one may be" (*śl.*8), and it brings about an identification of the adept with the deity.

These Khecarī-*mudrā*s are very complex and even bizarre yogic practices, combining body and hand gestures, strange facial expressions and the utterance of such sounds as *hā-hā*, together with mental concentration and visualizations. The total effect is that the adept feels that the *triśūlamaṇḍala* of the deity penetrates and pervades him completely, whilst he feels that his senses, his mind and his emotions are all fused with the deity and pervaded by the divine energies. He is not himself anymore; he is one with Śiva (*nāham asmīti manvan ekībhūtaṃ vicintayan* - *śl.*23) in whom reside all the deities and who illuminates the whole universe: *tatrasthā devatāḥ sarva dyotayanto akhilaṃ jagat* (*śl.*25). But, however "mystical" this experience may be, it is felt within the body and it occurs because of the bodily postures, etc., of which the *mudrā* consists. The role of the body is paramount.

Abh begins *āhnika* 32 with a definition of *mudrā* (*śl.*1-2). It is, he says, *pratibimba*, reflection, or rather *pratibimbodaya*, a term taken from the Devyāyāmalatantra, which he considers as being a *bahuvrīhi* that can be understood in two different ways. First, as that which arises from an original image (*bimbāt samudayo yasya*): the *mudrā* appears from the deity and is a reflection, a reproduction by man of the appearance (and nature) of the deity. Or *bimbodaya* can be understood as that from which the original arises, that which is a means whereby the original appears: *bimbasya yasyā udaya ity uktā tadupāyatā*.[6] For Abh, these two interpretations are equally valid. A *mudrā* has therefore a twofold nature and function: It reflects reality; i.e. the hand and body postures adopted by the adept, together with the visualizations, reflect, reproduce, the form

and attitude of the deity. But from these postures, etc., reproducing those of the deity, and from the visualizations of the divinity, there arises, for the adept, an identification with that deity. For him, the original appears and takes the place of the merely reflected image: he is possessed by the *devatā*, identified with her; the original is born from the reflection.

This interesting interpretation of *mudrā* is consistent with the ancient ritual tradition of the bhairavāgamas, where the adept must assume for ritual purposes the physical appearance of the *devatā* he worships. He must adopt her dress, ornaments and posture. This is clear from some of the rather bizarre yogic postures Abh describes in *śl.*12 to 62 of this 32nd *āhnika*. It appears still more, I am told by Alexis Sanderson, in such tantras as the Jayadrathayāmala, in one of whose *ṣaṭkas* a large number of *kāpālika mudrā*s are described, their use being to induce possession by the deity or, as this text says, to cause the entering into, or the being possessed by, the particular "flavor" of the deity: it leads to *rasāveśa*. Such also is the aim Abh assigns to *mudrā*s, though, obviously, on a more 'abstract' or 'intellectual' plane.

The *mudrā* performed during *pūjā*, he says (*śl.*67) serves to reinforce the presence of the deity: *[devī]sannidhaye*. When executed at the end of the *pūjā*, the *mudrā* serves to resorb the gods that were worshipped into the worshipper, thus reinforcing his unity with them: *aikyena visarjanam*. *Mudrā*s, he also says (*śl.*66), cause possession by (non-individual) consciousness: *bodhāveśa*, the entry into the essence (of Reality): *svarūpagati*. The yogic, bodily and mental practice of the *mudrā* induces an intense participation in what is being ritually performed. It is both the cause, the outward expression, and the effect of the complete fusion of the adept with the deity. When saying this at the end of the *āhnika*, Abh merely confirms and reinforces what he said at the beginning (*śl.*3) when he gave the *nirukta* explanation of the word *mudrā*: "*mudrā* is so called in the śāstras because it is that which gives, that which bestows, upon the self, *through the body* (*dehadvārena*), a bliss which is the attainment of one's real nature".[7] *Mudrā*s, he adds later on (*śl.*49-50), using another *nirukta*, are in fact energies (*śaktayaḥ*) which are so called because they liberate the adept from all states of existence and destroy all his fetters; they are energies of the supreme Goddess: *pārameśvaryaḥ śaktaya eva mudrāḥ*, adds J (p. 326).

I should add, as regards Abh.'s notion of *mudrā*, that he distinguishes not only four different ways of performing *mudrā*s - by hand, body, speech and mind - but also and most importantly between two categories, or rather two levels, in their execution: *niṣkala* and *sakala*. All the *mudrā*s described in the MVT, for instance, are *sakala*. Such, I believe, are also those of the VMT/NṢA and YH I mentioned earlier. *Sakalamudrā*s,

he says (*śl.*7), are many but not important. They are mere contortions of the body. For him the only important one, which is *niṣkala*, is the Khecarī, together with its variants: Triśūlinī, Karaṅkinī, Krodhanī, etc. This is because only the Khecarī identifies the adept with the highest aspect of the deity and bestows liberation. This kind of *mudrā* is meant therefore for the *mumukṣu* and not for the *bubhukṣu sādhaka*, who is rather to use the other *mudrā*s, which thus form part of the *kāmya* ritual. It is only for those who practice *kāmya* rites, says Abh (*śl.*8), that the *sakalamudrā*s can be of any importance. It results that for the adept of Abh.'s Trika the Khecarī *mudrā* forms part of the daily, compulsory ritual, the *nityāpūjā*. Though *niṣkala*, the Khecarī is a complex yogic practice. So here again the *mudrā*s appear as aspects of the body's participation in the ritual. Ritual, as a process of identification with the godhead, is intensely experienced, expressed and corporally played out by the adept by means of the *mudrā*.

We have seen that Abh says (TĀ, 32.8) that the *mudrā* Khecarī can be performed anywhere. Towards the end of the *āhnika* he adds that it may be performed not only during *pūjā* but also during various rituals, as well as *jñānayogaparimarśe* - at the time of awareness due to *jñānayoga*. He goes on to say (*śl.*67) that *mudrā*s produce, together with the entrance into one's true nature (*svarūpagati*), the destruction of doubt (*śaṅkadalanam*), as well as what he calls *cakrodayadīpti*, which may be understood as the awakening and illumination of the "wheels" of the sense-organs and of the mind, i.e. their complete pervasion by the light of divine energy. What takes place is a fusion of the individual mind with the cosmic energy. Thus the *mudrā*s, in so far as they serve to strengthen the identification of the yogin with the *śakticakra* - that is, the totality of divine, cosmic and vital energy - emerge as not only bodily and mental elements of ritual action, but also ways and means of liberation (*mokṣopāya*) of a typically *śāktopāya* kind. This is not surprising since we have seen that these *mudrā*s are *kuṇḍalinīyoga* practices aiming at the union of the energy of the adept with that of the cosmos.

*Mudrā*s as something entirely separate from any specific ritual are in fact to be met with in a number of texts. We may quote, for instance, the Khecarī prescribed in Kṣemarāja's Vimarśinī on Śivasūtra, 2.5. Or, better, Vijñānabhairava, 77 (a text known to Abh and J), which says that the *mudrā*s Karaṅkinī, Krodhanī, Bhairavī, Lelihānī and Khecarī (all quoted in TĀ, 32) can bring about the fusion of the adept with the supreme: *parā vyāptiḥ*. But a number of other instances of such non-ritual use of *mudrā*s could easily be adduced.

To conclude this brief survey of the way *mudrā*s are conceived of in some śaiva traditions, we should examine the nature of the role played by the body in ritual action. That the body does play a role in ritual is obvious: ritual is action. The same Sanskrit word applies to ritual action and to action in general (and its consequences), and all action has a corporeal side. But how is the bodily action experienced by the actor? How far is he involved in what he does? To such a question one can only give a very tentative answer, so various are the conditions in which *mudrā*s are used. *Mudrā*s are always gestures which accomplish something. But how much does one really achieve with gestures? How much does the actor believe he achieves?

In a very general, and therefore inaccurate, way, I would first suggest that the performer of a ritual is probably much less involved personally (or not involved at all) when celebrating a "public", temple, *parārtha*, rite, than when performing a private ritual, usually done *ātmārtha*, even when it is not a *kāmya* rite. Secondly, one may perhaps make a broad distinction between two positions that are found in the texts on the subject. [1] In most ritual works, notably the Śaivāgamas and śaiva paddhatis, the mere display of the prescribed *mudrā*, or even a mere statement of what is being done, generally seems to be held sufficient. [2] In the Bhairavāgamas and other works of the bhairavic or kāpālika tradition, ancient conceptions about the *āveśa* of the adept by the deity still seem to prevail, and *mudrā*s are seen chiefly as bodily attitudes implying a mystical participation or experience on the part of the performer, or even in certain cases as purely mystical attitudes. There is in fact probably no such clear-cut opposition between the two types of śaiva traditions. There are also other, non-śaiva, traditions: vaiṣṇava, buddhist, etc., which ought also to be taken into account before any general conclusion is reached. The whole subject would certainly repay study.

Notes

1. Amṛtānanda in his commentary (p. 75-6/71) further explains *drāvaṇa* as *tadekarasībhāva*, the fact, for supreme consciousness (*saṃvid*), to have the same essence as the universe: the deity as *mudrā* would thus confirm her essential oneness (*ekarasya*) with the cosmos.

T. Goudriaan draws my attention to a passage (*śl.*76-112) of the 6th *paṭala* of the Kubjikāmatatantra (pp.216-219 of his edition, Brill, 1988) where *mudrā*s are described as energies (*śaktayaḥ*) pervading the cosmos, ensnaring and liberating, identified with the Saptamātaraḥ, but also equated with the supreme Energy (*paramā śaktiḥ*), and also linked each to each of the five fingers and to the two hands: a complex nature also.

2. *vyomadvayāntarālasthabindurūpā maheśvari* //62
śivaśaktyātmasaṃśleṣād divyāveśakarī smṛtā /
caturdaśāracakrasthā saṃvidānandavigrahā //63//.

3. Of V.V. Dvivedi's edition of the YH (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1988); p. 74-5 of Gopinath Kaviraj's edition (Varanasi, 1963).

4. Where exactly those five *bindu*s are located is not clear.

5. This passage is reproduced in a slightly modified form in TĀ, 32-10-12, which (together with J's comm.) confirms the yogic nature of this *mudrā*: it is a corporeal-mental practice whereby the mind is to be directed to the navel, after which the yogin must cause the breath to rise vertically through the centers of the subtle body up to the *dvādaśānta* (TĀ, vol. 12, p. 309).

6. *mudrā ca pratibimbātmā śrīmaddevyākhyayāmale* /
uktā bimbodayaśrutyā vācyadvayavivecanāt //1//
bimbātmasamudayo yasyā ityuktā pratibimbatā /
bimbasya yasyā udaya ityuktā tadupāyatā //2// (vol. 12, p. 303-4)

7. *mudaṃ svarūpalābhākhyaṃ dehadvāreṇa cātmanām* /
rāty arpayati yat tena mudrā śāstreṣu varṇitā //3// (*ibid.*, p. 305)

Kubjikāmata Tantra: the Laghvikāmnāya version

J.A. Schoterman

For their critical edition of the Kubjikāmata Tantra in its Kulālikāmnāya version (KMT; ed. by T. Goudriaan & J.A. Schoterman, Leiden 1988) the editors made use of all available palm leaf manuscripts and a careful selection of the numerous paper manuscripts (cf. KMT p.3ff) with one notable exception, however: the allegedly oldest manuscript[1] of the KMT, ms Z, was excluded because it contains another redaction of the KMT, the Laghvikāmnāya version (cf. KMT p.32). Besides the fact that ms Z offers a shorter version (ca. 2000 stanzas) of the KMT (ca. 3500 stanzas), two main differences between the two versions were noted down at the time: 1) Z has another division into paṭalas; 2) Z has Laghvikā instead of Kubjikā, and Śaṅkara instead of Bhairava (KMT p.30). In the present study I intend to discuss these differences more closely without going into too much detail, however. A general comparison between the edited text of the KMT (= Kulālikāmnāya) and its version in Z (= Laghvikāmnāya) may already prove quite illustrative.[2]

As the KMT, the version of the text in Z is also divided into twenty-five chapters or paṭalas which are all regularly marked with a colophon at the end. Twelve of these colophons, however, are inserted in the text at a place other than in the KMT. As a rule, another occurrence of a colophon in Z results in the absence of at least one complete śloka from the KMT: 1,43 (= 1st colophon in Z), 53 (= 2nd col.); 2,23 (= 4th col.); 3,20 (= 6th col.), 30 (= 7th col.); 14,60cd-61ab (= 11th col.); 15,37 (= 13th col.), 57 (= 14th col.); 17,60 (= 17th col.); 19,57cd-59ab (= 19th col.), 76-88ab (= 20th col.); 25,29-107ab (= 24th col.). Whether the last instance actually belongs to this series is open to some doubt as Z deviates here significantly from the edited text (see below, p.79). One other instance should be mentioned in this respect: although the fifth colophon of Z is found at the same place as in the KMT (= KMT 2nd col.), some lines are yet omitted in Z (sc. 3,1-3ab). The same lines, however, are also omitted in some manuscripts of the KMT so that the absence of these lines may very well represent an original condition (cf. KMT p.31).

The other division into paṭalas in Z appears to be more satisfactory in some instances, but sometimes Z seems to overdo. Thus, for instance, the division of KMT paṭala 1 into three small chapters in Z is perhaps a little too zealous. On the other hand, however, Z is indeed more satisfactory sometimes. The concept of the Pañca Cakra (sc. Devī Cakra, Dūtī Cakra, etc.) is explained in three chapters in the KMT (14-16), whereas Z discusses the five in six separate chapters (Z 11-16): the fourth Cakra,

the Yoginī Cakra (KMT 15,38-83), is treated in two chapters (Z 14&15) as may already be inferred from the KMT itself (cf. 15,58;59; Z omits 15,57). Again, with regard to the fourfold series of *piṇḍa* - *pada* - *rūpa* - *rūpātīta* (KMT 17-19) Z has an apparently better division into chapters (Z 17-21; Z treats *rūpa* in two chapters; cf. KMT 19,59d;60ab). In these two instances Z's chapter division seems preferable to that of the KMT because it marks out the topics more clearly. In the case of the Ṣaṭ Cakra (sc. Ādhāra, Svādhiṣṭhāna, etc.), however, Z follows a different direction. In the KMT the Ṣaṭ Cakra are discussed in three chapters with no logical division into paṭalas (KMT 11-13). Here, Z does not divide the six into six separate paṭalas, but deals with the Ṣaṭ Cakra in one, long chapter (Z 10).

Besides this sometimes different division into chapters, it is obvious that the major difference between the two versions is constituted by the fact that Z is an odd 1500 stanzas shorter than the KMT. As we have already seen, some lines from the KMT are dropped in Z because of the insertion of a colophon in the latter. These lines, however, form only a fraction of the total of KMT lines not found in Z. It is clearly beyond the scope of the present study to enumerate and discuss all these missing lines, but some remarks are requisite here.

The most striking difference between the KMT and Z in this context is the absence of six complete chapters in the latter: 4 (*mantravidyā*; Mālinī Gahvara), 5 (the Umāmāheśvara mantra, etc.), 6 (*mantravidyā*; three *mudrā*s), 21 (on the fifty *dvīpas*), 22 (two alphabetical systems; on the 24 *pīṭhas*), 24 (two mystical alphabets; on *arcana* and *pavitrārohaṇa*). With regard to the absence of chapters 21 and 22 in Z it is noteworthy that these two chapters clearly form a kind of interlude in the KMT: chapter 20 ends with Bhairava stating that now the Kālacakra will be explained, but this is actually not found until the 23rd chapter. Obviously, the order of chapters links up better in Z by leaving these two chapters out.

The absence of these six chapters accounts for most of the difference in size between the KMT and Z, but within the text itself there are some stray lines which are lacking in Z. Several stanzas appear to be missing in Z because they were probably overlooked by the scribe. Thus, for instance, 10,90;91 are not found in Z because the scribe was somewhat careless here: ślokas 89d and 91d both end in *prapadyate* so that a mistake is easily made in copying.[3] These omissions, however, have clearly no textual implications as they are merely caused by the inaccuracy of one particular scribe. More important from a textual point of view are those lines missing in Z, which are also absent in some manuscripts of the KMT.[4] Next, a few longer parts of the KMT are not found

in Z, which might be due to their more or less appendical nature.[5] There is only one instance where the text of Z is seriously mixed up in comparison with the KMT. Part of the 7th chapter is quite defectively reproduced in Z: after śloka 20, Z becomes rather confused, probably because of the similarity between the mantras given in the following lines. In the case of the Hṛdayadūtī of Kubjikā a considerable part of the text is evidently missing in Z (7,51-86), but since the mantra of the Hṛdayadūtī is given in code here (7,55c-78) this omission can be accounted for (see below).

Generally speaking, Z faithfully follows the edited text of the KMT as far as it contains that text. It is true that the variant readings are very abundant in Z and contain many corruptions (cf. KMT p.32), but it remains a matter of further research to determine whether these represent important dogmatic differences or not. Only in two instances Z has definitely a longer reading of its own. In an enumeration of the fifty Bhairavas representing the fifty letters of the alphabet (10,120-128ab) the text of Z does not agree with the KMT or one of its manuscripts, although the contents are very much the same. More significant is the other instance. In KMT 17,94-109 the fifty letters of the alphabet in their Mālinī order (sc. *na* up to *pha*), their presiding goddesses, and their location on the body are enumerated. The corresponding lines in Z do not include the names of the fifty goddesses. It follows that the wording of the text is therefore different in Z.

The two above-mentioned instances where Z deviates from the KMT, have one thing in common: they both deal with the alphabet and its symbolic implications. Here we come across a peculiar difference between the KMT and Z. Although here (17,94-109) and elsewhere (18,56 (a mantra)) Z acknowledges the Mālinī order of the alphabet, it did not include the Mālinī Gahvara (chapter 4) in its text. Since the Mālinī Gahvara is primarily used to code mantras, it is not surprising to find that those parts of the KMT where mantras are given by means of a code based on the Mālinī or, as it is, on the Śabdarāśi (sc. the fifty Bhairavas) systems, are completely left out.[6] Once Z gives a mantra in full whereas the KMT uses a code (18,4-24). The only exception to this is found in the 18th chapter. In 18,65-66 the bījas of the Pañca Ratna are given by means of a Mālinī code, and are consequently left out in Z. The next line (18,67), however, where the bīja *hrīṃ* is given in exactly the same way, is included in Z. Possibly this śloka was not recognized as containing a code. Apart from this last instance, however, Z displays a remarkable aversion to the symbolism of the fifty letters as used in encoding mantras - a practice regularly found in the KMT and, especially, in the

slightly younger Ṣaṭsāhasra Saṃhitā, the longer version of the KMT. We will return to this salient difference between the KMT and Z later.

In order to conclude this short discussion of the surface differences between the KMT and its version in Z, it is necessary to say a few words about the last chapter of the KMT and its redaction in Z. The 25th chapter of the KMT is divided into two different chapters in Z, namely 24 and 25. Chapter 24 of Z contains the text of KMT 25,1-28 (no omitted lines; note that KMT mss DE also have a (second!) 24th colophon here). The final chapter in Z opens with 4½ stanza, part of which is also found in KMT mss DE after 25,110a. Z opens its 25th chapter with the following lines which I have slightly corrected:

śrīdevy uvāca //
kṣetrapīṭhāni deveśi, diśair dehasthitāni ca /
śrutāni ca vilomena, idānīṃ paṅktito vada //
anekārthavide devi, bhrāntijñānaṃ na yuñcasi /
ebhir etaiś ca paryāyaiḥ, santoṣaḥ kiṃ na te 'vabhūt //
yathāpi śṛṇu kalyāṇi, prayāgaṃ brahmamaṇḍale /
vārāṇasī tu nābhisthā, kollagiry udare sthitam //
aṭṭahāsaṃ hṛdisthaṃ tu, ujjenī kaṇṭhakūpataḥ /
caritraṃ vaktramadhye tu, ekāmraṃ nayanāntare //
devikoṭaṃ tu māyādho, vyāpinyāguṇapūritam /
śarīreva samākhyātaṃ, gṛhasthaṃ śṛṇu sāmpratam // (= 25,110(a)b)

next follow: 25,110cd-116ab,
gṛhe 'pi ca tathāpy evaṃ, purasthaṃ śṛṇu sāmpratam /
25,107cd-109,
upakṣetraṃ tu tatraiva, mantavyaṃ sādhakena tu /
25,116cd; 121ab; 186ab-232.[7]

After this cursory survey of both texts I proceed with the second difference between the KMT and Z, to wit: Laghvikā instead of Kubjikā, and Śaṅkara instead of Bhairava (see above, p.76). Here we should make a distinction between the occurrence of these names in a caption (sc. *kubjikā/bhairava uvāca*) and their occurrence within the text itself.

As regards the captions, the following observations are due. In the KMT as edited we always find the same two interlocutors, namely Kubjikā and Bhairava.[8] In the first chapter which has a more narrative character, Himavān pops up thrice, but he is left out in Z. Kubjikā does not feature in the captions of Z, but is replaced by Devī or Laghvī/Laghvikā. Instead of Bhairava Z reads Śaṅkara, Bhairava, Maheśvara, Bhagavān, or Śambhu (in order of frequency). In twelve instances the captions are omitted in Z, but are incorporated in the following pāda (e.g. 17,85 *śrīkubjikā uvāca // paramaṃ vada kauleśa*, Z: *laghvy uvāca mahādeva*).

Within the text the following changes are noted. The name Bhairava is sometimes retained, but more often it is replaced by Maheśvara or Śaṅkara. In much the same way Kujeśvara and Kuleśvara are usually (but not always) replaced by Maheśvara. The female counterparts of these last two, i.e. Kujeśvarī and Kuleśvarī, are likely to be found as Maheśvarī in Z, but again not always. The same holds true for Kubjikā herself: in the majority of cases we find Laghvikā instead, but there are quite a few exceptions. Moreover, Kubjī is replaced by Gaurī four times (8,38a; 39a; 47a; 19,13c), and once Z reads Kumbhikā instead of Kubjikā (15,54c). Besides Kubjikā, however, there are other names which are changed into Laghvikā in Z. Instead of Kālī (1,29c) and Kālikā (1,30a) we find Laghvī and Laghvikā, respectively. Olambikā (2,37a) and Samayā (7,43c) also become Laghvikā in Z. Devī is replaced with Laghvī in only two instances, but since this is not done elsewhere in Z, one might assume that Devī is not original here, at least not in the manuscript copied by the scribe of Z or one of his forerunners (14,39c (*kubji* ms G, *laghvi* mss DE); 23,60c (*kubji* mss CGT)).

Quite inevitably we now reach the big issue: which of the two versions of the Kubjikāmata Tantra is the more original, the longer Kulālikāmnāya version dedicated to Kubjikā or the shorter Laghvikāmnāya version in which Laghvikā features as the main goddess? A full treatment of this question should necessarily imply a close examination of all the variant readings in Z, but a few preliminary observations may yet be made.

Although Laghvikā is undoubtedly the leading lady in Z, Kubjikā is certainly not ruled out completely. Kubjikā is still mentioned in several instances in Z. In the KMT, on the other hand, Laghvikā is mentioned only twice. In the 24th chapter of the KMT (not in Z!) Laghvinī is mentioned among the so-called Vṛddhapañcaka which consists of Kamalā, Barbarā, Mahāntārī, Laghvinī, and Bimbākhyā (24,100cd-101ab). The first four goddesses are also mentioned in a mantra connected with the Ṣaḍaṅganyāsa: Kamalakubjikā, Barbarā, Mahantārikā,. Laghvikā, Viśvatejinī, and Koṅkaṇāvvā (7,39). In this context one other passage in the KMT should be mentioned. In a short survey of the fourfold series of *piṇḍa* - *pada* - *rūpa* - *rūpātīta* four forms of Kubjikā related to these four are enumerated: Kubjeśī, Mahāntārī, Barbarā, Kamalānanā (17,51;52). In Z Kubjeśī is replaced by Laghvikā here.[9] From these instances in the KMT it might be inferred that Laghvikā belongs to a group of four goddesses, the others being Kamalā, Barbarā, and Mahāntārī. As such, Laghvikā appears to feature as a secondary manifestation of Kubjikā related to *piṇḍa*. This is also hinted at in KMT 17,24d-25 (*piṇḍastham śṛṇu kubjini* // *vṛddhakramasya madhyasthām, laghurūpām sutejasām*) where both *vṛddha*

and *laghu* are mentioned in this respect. Although Laghvikā is mentioned twice in the KMT, the occurrence of her name in the 24th chapter is questionable because the manuscripts of the KMT diverge widely here (cf. KMT p.127; 128; App. III). This actually leaves us with only one certain reference to Laghvikā in the KMT, namely in the mantra found in 7,39. In this respect it is noteworthy that this is factually the only occurrence of Laghvikā in a mantra, in the KMT as well as in Z. In other words: although Z frequently reads Laghvikā instead of Kubjikā throughout the text, it does not do so in the mantras; the only occurrence of the name Laghvikā in a mantra Z shares with the KMT. Presumably, the mantras did originally contain the name Kubjikā and were considered too sacred to be tampered with, namely to replace Kubjikā by Laghvikā. Another indication for a possible predominance of Kubjikā over Laghvikā is perhaps found in connection with the name Khañjikā, another manifestation of the Goddess. In Z the name Khañjikā is everywhere replaced by Laghvikā.[10] Especially the 16th chapter is significant in this context. In KMT 16,15-23 three names of the Goddess are "etymologically" explained: Tvaritā, Khañjikā, and Kubjikā. Contrary to what one might expect, Z does not change Kubjikā here into Laghvikā, but reads Laghvikā instead of Khañjikā. Again, the name Kubjikā was apparently too fundamental here to be simply replaced by Laghvikā.

As we have seen, Z promotes Laghvikā at the expense of Kubjikā, but it does not disavow the latter completely. Z even "admits" that Laghvikā is a secondary manifestation of Kubjikā in 17,51ab (see above). This same attitude of Z can be inferred from its colophons: Z clearly distinguishes itself from the KMT proper, but still acknowledges the latter's authority. At the end of each chapter in Z it is stated that it concerns the KMT, but within the tradition of Laghvikā: *ity evaṃ laghvikāmnāye śrīmatkubjikāmatottare* ... . This distinction between the original text, the Kubjikāmata Tantra, and a particular tradition, the Laghvikāmnāya, may also be inferred from the text itself. In all instances where the Kubjikāmata is mentioned in the text, Z does not alter the name into Laghvikāmata[11] or a corresponding variant.[12] References to the Western Tradition, the Paścimāmnāya (2,22a) or Paścimānvaya (2,47d), are also maintained in Z. However, direct references to the tradition of Kubjikā are changed: Kubjāmnāya (25,208d) becomes the more general Kramāmnāya; Kubjikāmnāya (10,38b) and Kulālikāmnāya (17,59a) are both changed into Laghvikāmnāya.

From the foregoing it has become plausible that we are concerned with one Tantric system, the Kubjikāmata, which is handed down in two different recensions, the Kubjikāmnāya or Kulālikāmnāya and the Laghvikāmnāya. Furthermore, it seems probable that the Laghvikāmnāya is of

secondary importance to the Kulālikāmnāya of which it constitutes an offshoot with no viability as it is preserved in one manuscript only (sc. ms Z). Yet, this one manuscript of the Laghvikāmnāya may prove to be important for our knowledge of the Kubjikāmata, especially with regard to its conveying into writing.

From the divergence of the oldest manuscripts of the KMT already three different groups of texts can be discerned (KMT p.27) with an additional later fourth (KMT pp.27; 32). This warrants the assumption that several centuries of textual transmission have preceded the 11th century from which the oldest manuscripts of the Kubjikāmata date. No tangible traces from this period have come down to us, partly because the texts were transmitted orally from teacher to pupil. Here we advance the hypothesis that the Laghvikāmnāya may be closer to this oral transmission than the text of the KMT as edited. A possible confirmation of this assumption are those parts of the KMT not found in Z. Those stanzas lacking in Z because it inserts a colophon, can easily be disposed of and do not hamper the train of thought. The enumeration of the six *prakāras* (1,43: Ānanda, etc.), for instance, seems definitely out of place here. They are discussed more appropriately in 14,51 as the six Kulasiddhas. The longer passages not found in Z are of an appendical nature (see above, p.78), and may therefore not be original. The same holds true for the six chapters lacking in Z: they mostly contain information of a more general nature, especially on *mantravidyā*, and at least two of these chapters are probably later insertions (see above, p.77). We have already mentioned the fact that Z does not contain the exposé on the Mālinī Gahvara, and its aversion to present mantras in a code based on this Mālinī Gahvara (see above, p.78). The main purpose to present a mantra in code is to keep it secret from outsiders. This is certainly useful in case mantras are written down since a manuscript may fall into the wrong hands, but in case of an oral transmission this procedure is quite pointless. Since the teacher instructs his pupil on a secluded spot where there is no danger of being overheard by any outsider, there is hardly any use for a code. Moreover, memorizing by heart a long mantra in encoded form is far from simple if not impossible. This may account for the fact that Z either gives a mantra in full or not at all, but never in code (with one minor exception in 18,67). If a mantra is missing in Z, it does not necessarily imply that the mantra is unknown. After all, the fact that a written text is not the final thing is attested for throughout the texts: some information has still to be provided by the teacher himself (*guruvaktrāt*). Especially the arcane lore of the mantras seems to fit in with this condition.

At the present stage of research it seems plausible that the Laghvikāmnāya represents an early offshoot of the Kubjikāmata, offering a text which may be closer to the (oral) original. Apparently this branch of the Kubjikāmata had no follow up, but reminiscenses of it are found in the oldest manuscript of the Kubjikāmata in its Kulālikāmnāya version, namely ms D (around 1100 A.D.). Why or when exactly this promotion of Laghvikā began is still obscure, nor why it proved so little viable.

Notes

1. According to its colophon the manuscript was written in 1037-'38 A.D. during the reign of King Lakṣmīkāmadeva (1024-1040): *aṣṭapaṃcāśadadhike śate saṃvatsare gate / śrīlakṣmīkāmadevasya rājye niṣkaṇṭake śubhe* (KMT p. 14).

2. In order to avoid confusion between the two versions I follow the numbering of paṭalas and ślokas of the edited text, unless stated otherwise.

3. Also: 9,38d-39a; 10,11c; 13,5b-6a; 13,90b; 13,95a; 20,6-7b.

4. 3,1-3b; 9,66ab; 10,87c-88b; 10,129c-131b; 13,95ab (cf. note 3); 18,35c; 18,36cd; 19,53cd-54; 20,64cd-66ab (KMT mss CD omit 64c-65b).

5. 10,52-63ab; 12,53cd-67ab; 23,149-172.

6. 5,34cd-40ab; 7,55c-78; 13,69ab-70ab; 18,44ab-51ab; 23,91ab-97; 24,4ff.

7. Omitted are: 25,29-107ab; 117-120; 121cd-185; 212-214; 218-219.

8. Some mss of the KMT have occasionally Devī or Laghvī/Laghvikā instead of Kubjikā, and Devadeva, Śaṅkara, Bhagavān, Maheśvara, Śambhu, or Kuleśvara for Bhairava.

9. Note that ms D reads Lambikā (cf. 2,37a Olambikā) here, and ms E Laghvikā.

10. 3,36b; 16,15b; 19c; 20c; 21a; 17,62a.

11. So far, I have found the appellation Laghvikāmata only in the 15th colophon of ms E.

12. 10,32d; 39d; 16,29b; 18,113b; 20,57d; 68c; 70a; 79d; 25,206b.

The 108 Names of the Goddess Tripurā in the Māhātmyakhaṇḍa of the Tripurārahasya

Silvia Schwarz Linder

I

As we are well aware, the figure of Tripurā is associated to a long and authoritative tradition, called *Saubhāgyasampradāya*. This tradition is characteristic of Southern India and Kāśmīr and has evolved mostly in the period ranging from the Middle Ages to the 18th century.

Tripurā, also known as Tripurasundarī or Lalitā, represents "the most important Tantric form of Śrī/Lakṣmī ... the foremost benign, beautiful and youthful, yet motherly manifestation of the Supreme *Śakti*".[1] However she constitutes not only a particular manifestation of the *Paraśakti*, but also covers the totality of such manifestations in their polyvalent and "contradictory" aspects.

Her worship is based on the twofold doctrine of the *Śrīvidyā* and of the *Śrīcakra*, the *mantra* and the *yantra* which constitute, respectively, the sonorous body and the graphical symbol of the *Devī* and of her power manifesting the universe.

This divine figure turns out to be particularly interesting, since her worship is linked to some very important philosophical-religious trends:

- in the first place to the Tantric tradition of the *Kula* (or *Kaula*) and in particular to the variety called *Śrīkula* on which is based the worship of Tripurasundarī in Southern India;

- secondly, to the Śaivism of Kāśmīr, and especially to the school of the *Pratyabhijñā*, where the metaphysical doctrines of such tradition are developed;

- finally to the *Kevalādvaitavāda*, which is mostly to be found in Southern India, and is in conformity with the *Veda* and the brāhmaṇical orthodoxy.

The authority of this form of the Goddess is not only due to her popularity - a popularity which is particularly relevant in today's Southern India - but also to the meaning ascribed to the divine figure in the course of the history of the śaktic cults in their passage from the North to the South of the subcontinent. Another reason for her authority is the prestige she enjoys with the *smārta*, the most conservative circles of the orthodox community.

II

The *corpus* of texts concerning the worship of Tripurā/Tripurasundarī, although being comparatively small if compared to analogous sources concerning other forms of the Goddess (like, for instance, Durgā and Kālī) is rich enough to justify an accurate investigation of the material.

Within this *corpus* the *Tripurārahasya* (The Mystery (or: The Secret Doctrine, or: The Esoterical Teaching) of the <Goddess> Tripurā) holds an especially meaningful position. It is a Southern India work that has been written probably between the 10th and the 17th century.

The text, composed of 12,000 *ślokas* in purāṇic style, is divided into three parts. The *Māhātmyakhaṇḍa* (The Section <Dedicated to the> Celebration or Majesty <of the Goddess>) is made of 6,687 *ślokas* and is divided into 80 *adhyāyas*. This section - not yet translated into a Western language - deals with the myths related to the origin of Tripurā, describes her various manifestations and tells the gestures of Lalitā and Lalitā's fight against the demon Bhaṇḍa and the army of the *Asuras*.

The *Jñānakhaṇḍa* (Section <Related to> Knowledge) is better known than the MK. It is made of 2163 *ślokas*, divided into 22 *adhyāyas* which deal with philosophical matters. The esoterical teachings provided by the text are illustrated and exemplified through parables and allegories.

The third part, *Caryākhaṇḍa* (The Section <which Provides the Rules of Proper> Behaviour), which has been lost, had probably included some 3000 remaining *ślokas*. Its content may have shown some affinity to that of the *Kalpasūtra* ascribed to Paraśurāma, a work (made of 335 *sūtras* and divided into 10 *khaṇḍas*) which deals with the secrets related to the worship of Tripurā according to the ritual of the *Śrīvidyā*.

The *Tripurārahasya* is a Tantric text, of *Śākta* tendency, based on a rich philosophical background. The conception of the Supreme Reality - similar to that found in the *Vedānta* - is matched by a remarkable command of the lexicon and of the philosophical categories which are characteristic of the Śaivism of Kāśmīr. As Gopinath Kaviraj[2] and other scholars have remarked, this testifies the deep-reaching influence of this system of thought, and in particular of the schools of the *Spanda* and of the *Pratyabhijñā*.

III

The section we are dealing with here - the *Māhātmyakhaṇḍa* - is a mythological narration intercalated by *stotras*, ritual prescriptions and esoterical teachings. It is therefore structured in a Purāṇic manner. For

the description of the various manifestations of the Great Goddess - here worshipped as Tripurā - the text can be referred to various Purāṇic sources, and foremost to the *Devīmāhātmya* of the *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa*. Almost all the second part, dedicated to the celebration of the gestures of Lalitā, is inspired by the *Lalitāmāhātmya* of the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*.

The importance ascribed to the figure of Lalitā is evidence of the fact that the Goddess worshipped in our text and called at times with the names of Tripurā, Tripurasundarī, Lalitā, Ṣoḍaśī, Śrīvidyā, Kāmeśvarī, a.s.o. and celebrated as the Lady of *Śrīpura* and of the Island of the Jewels (*Maṇidvīpa*), is none other than the divinity of the *Śrīyantra*.[3]

The *Māhātmyakhaṇḍa* contains 22 hymns dedicated to the Goddess. They not only mark the peaks of the narration but are also the most lyrical part of the poem, enriched by mythical and philosophical references.

Among these hymns, the *Saubhāgyāṣṭottaraśatanāmastotra* (Auspicious Hymn Containing 108 Names) is of particular importance: it is the only hymn of the 108 Names of the Goddess Tripurā to be found in our text; also, it is located in the middle of the episode related to Kāma.

In the *Māhātmyakhaṇḍa* the myth of Kāma shows some relevant changes with respect to the better known Purāṇic versions. Usually, the origin of Kāma is ascribed to Brahmā,[4] here he is born from the mind of Lakṣmī as a child of celestial brightness.[5] Such a birth from the Goddess who rose from the churning of the ocean (*samudramathana*) reminds us of the birth of Eros, son of Aphrodite, who also rose from the waves of the sea. Moreover, Kāma is usually born already adult: here he is a child like Eros. Lakṣmī, patron of Friday, is comparable to Aphrodite in this version of the myth clearly linked to the ancient astrological context.

In our text the God of Love addresses himself to Lakṣmī, in addition to Tripurā (her *alter ego*), in order to obtain the power he needs to divert Śiva from his ascetical practice. In the 24th *adhyāya* we learn that Kāma asked his mother to turn him almighty. In order to fulfil his wish Lakṣmī revealed to him the secret of the Goddess Tripurā (*Tripurādevyā rahasya*), a secret that was hidden in her 108 Names. The young God then withdrew himself in a cave on the mount Mandara to propitiate the Goddess by reciting her Names.

After some time Tripurā appeared to him in a dream and revealed the knowledge that consisted of fifteen parts and which was hidden within the hymn of the 108 Names. Hence Kāma, encouraged by Lakṣmī, spent three divine years in meditation, to deepen the knowledge he had been given access to.

At the end of this long period,[6] the Goddess Tripurā appeared to him. Encircled by a shining aura, she was holding the noose (*pāśa*), the

elephant hook (*aṅkuśa*) and her other attributes. At her side, Lakṣmī and Sarasvatī were holding the fly-whisks made of white tails of the yak (*camara*), insignia of royalty.

When she asked Kāma what he wished, he recited her a hymn of praise and answered that her sight (*darśana*) was enough to gratify him.

However the Goddess, who wanted to show her benevolence, presented him with a bow and arrows made out of her own attributes, thus granting him invincibility. Before vanishing she said that the knowledge she conveyed would have been acquired through the name of Kāma and she called the hymn of the 108 Names *Saubhāgyāṣṭottaraśatanāmastotra* (Auspicious Hymn Containing 108 Names); hence she called *Saubhāgyanavaratnastotra* (Auspicious Hymn Containing Nine Gems) the hymn of nine verses recited by Kāma, and finally she called *Saubhāgyavidyā* (Auspicious Knowledge that Grants Good Luck) the knowledge she had transmitted.[7]

The 26th *adhyāya* opens with the *Saubhāgyāṣṭottaraśatanāmastotra*, preceded by information concerning the *ṛṣi* who had transmitted it - Śiva himself -, the *chanda* in which it is composed - *anuṣṭubh* - and the *devatā* to whom it is dedicated - Śrīlalitāmbikā (The Venerable Mother Lalitā). The hymn is followed by the illustration of its effectiveness (*phalaśruti*).

The fact that this kind of indication is given reveals the desire to ascribe to the *stotra* a dignity comparable to that of the vedic hymns, as is usually the case for hymns of worship, and especially for those composed of names of divinities.

Finally, the hymn is doubly acrostic: on the one hand, the fact that it is made of fifteen stanzas hints certainly also to the *Śrīvidyā*[8] that is composed of fifteen syllables. The number fifteen, especially important for its mystical symbolism in the *Śrīvidyā* doctrine, is also a variant of the number of the *kalās* (moon's digits). The moon's digits are sixteen if one counts the immortal *kalā* that coincides with the night of the new moon.[9] On the other hand the *stotra* contains a variant (seemingly unknown) of the *kāmamantra*, namely: *kā e ī la (hrīṁ), ha rā sa (hrīṁ)*. This variant differs for instance from the *Manmathamantra* as quoted by Subrahmanya Sastri and Srinivasa Ayyangar in their commentary to the first stanza of the *Saundaryalaharī*: *ka e ī la hrīṁ, ha sa ka ha la hrīṁ, sa ka la hrīṁ*.[10]

The *Saubhāgyāṣṭottaraśatanāmastotra* is therefore most meaningful on account of its position within the text and its theological value. Like all hymns made out of divine epithets, this one too is a precious source of information regarding the myths and the iconography related to the divine figure, and thus providing a theology *in nuce*.

As we are aware, the hymns enumerating the 108 or 1008 Names of the Goddess, widely used in the cult, are to be found most frequently in the *Purāṇas*, in the *Āgamas*, and in the *Tantras*. An examination of such hymns will reveal, in addition to mythical and iconographic epithets specifically related to the divine figure to whom the hymn is dedicated, a series of identifications of the divine figure both with the various aspects of the Absolute (and with the reality manifested by it) and with the whole variety of the other forms, better known and more widely worshipped, of the Great Goddess.

IV

The richness and the complexity of Tripurā's character are suggested from the hymn's very beginning where she is addressed as "Lady of Kāma" and/or "Lady of Śiva Kāmeśvara" ("Kāmeśvarī"). It is well known that the unity of Śiva and *Śakti* represented in the center of the *Śrīyantra* is conceived as the union of Kāmeśvara and Kāmeśvarī.

The twofold relationship that links the Goddess both to Kāma and to Śiva is also stressed by the name "Kāmarūpā", which could be translated as "personification of <fulfilled> desire". The epithet is to be found in the *Ādyakālīsvarūpastotra* of the *Mahānirvāṇatantra*. Avalon translates it as "in the form of desire" and, in a footnote, he clarifies: "Kālikā Purāṇa says that Devī is called Kāma because She came to the secret place in the Blue Peak of the Great Mountain (Kailāsa) along with Śiva, for the sake of desire, and because She fulfils desires and destroys and restores the body of Kāma".[11]

The link to the *Śrīyantra* becomes even clearer when the Goddess is identified with the *kāmakalā*, the symbol of the union of Kāmeśvara and Kāmeśvarī in the *Yantra*'s center. This epithet defines her also as Lady of the *Śrīyantra*. As a matter of fact, as Avalon explains in his preface to the *Kāmakalāvilāsa* by Puṇyānandanātha, the *Kāmakalā*, "the Supreme Triangle formed of the *Bindu* and *Visarga*, of *Prakāśa* and *Vimarśa*, of Śiva and *Śakti*, of the 'I' (*Ahaṃ*) and 'This' (*Idaṃ*) or Universe is, in the supreme sense, the *Śiva-Svarūpa* and *Śakti-Svarūpa*".[12]

In addition to the more common epithets, we may note in this hymn more specific names, related to the philosophical and religious background of the system of the *Śrīvidyā*. These grant us a more lively and precise image of the Goddess.

Thus "Anuttarā" ("Without Superior"), recalls the technical term in Kashmiri Śaivism for: the supreme Conciousness, the highest Reality, the first principle on cosmological level.[13]

The Goddess is identified to this supreme Reality, which is always the same although named in different ways in the various philosophical systems. And, like this Reality, also the Goddess is "Anantā" ("Infinite") with respect to time, space and other entities or categories. We see that in the *Vedānta* texts the same expression (*ananta*) indicates the qualities of eternity, omnipresence, and unique reality of the *Brahman*.

We also read that the Goddess is "Adbhutarūpā" ("of wonderful shape"). This epithet can also be translated as "whose shape is wonder". It is the wonder, the astonishment of the devotee in front of the divinity. And this might remind us of the concept of wonder or surprise which is specific of the Kashmiri Śaivism. This idea - to be found already in the *Śivasūtra* and the *Spanda* school, where the term used for wonder is *vismaya* - becomes particularly important in the thought of Abhinavagupta, who actually employs the expression *camatkāra*. To quote Raniero Gnoli: "The *yogin* is penetrated by astonishment. The yogic stages are astonishment. The general idea underlying these words ... is that both the mystical and the aesthetic experience imply the cessation of a world - the ordinary, historical world, the *saṃsāra* - and its sudden replacement by a new dimension of reality. In this sense the two are wonder or surprise."[14]

The epithet "Edhadbhaktapātakanāśinī" ("she who nullifies the sins of those who are proud of being her devotees") also takes us back to the Kashmiri background. As a matter of fact, after having evoked the sense of wonder experienced by the *yogin*, this hymn suggests the idea of the devotee's pride which derives from the consciousness of his identity with Śiva. This emotion can be traced also in the *Stavacintāmaṇi* by Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa,[15] a classical text of the *Bhakti* of the Kashmiri Śaivism.

The fact that this text belongs to the Tantric tradition is also stressed by such epithets as:

- "Ekāntārcanapriyā" ("she who loves the cult <carried out> in secrecy"), where one hints to the secret surrounding the doctrines and the ritual practices of *Tantra*
- "Hālāpriyā" ("she who likes the liqueur"), where *hālā* stands for *madya* (wine), one of the elements of the *Pañcamakāra*.

The esoterical aspect of the teachings provided by the Goddess to her devotees/initiates is also suggested both by "Ekāntārcanapriyā" which could also mean "she who likes the worship of solitary men" or by "Ekāntajanapriyā" which can be rendered as "she, to whom the solitary men are dear" or as "dear to the solitary men".

In the *Lalitāsahasranāma* one reads that the Goddess is "Antarmukhasamārādhyā" ("well worshipped by the introspective"), where "'*antarmukha*' means those whose mind is turned inwards".[16] Here she is

"Antaḥpūjāpriyā" ("pleased by the inner worship") and "Antarvacomayī" ("she who is (in the shape of) the inner voice" or "nothing but inner word").

The identity of the *Devī* with the sound (*nāda*) heard by the *yogin* when he sinks deeply into himself is expressed by the epithet "Layakarṇī" ("she who can be heard when the sound fades away"), where the *Śakti* is identified with what is heard by the meditating devotee when the sound is more and more reabsorbed by silence.

From these very meaningful epithets stands out the main outline of the philosophical and doctrinal background of our text. Most other names found in the hymn - which cannot be discussed now for lack of time and space - are related to the various qualities and attributes of the Goddess and of her main manifestations.

For instance it is worth mentioning "Ikārabhāvyā" ("meditated in the form of the *I*" or "susceptible to be represented by the letter *I*"). As is known, the vowel *i* represents the Goddess and is the vivifying sign of the *Śakti* without which Śiva would be just a *śava*, a corpse.[17] In the *Lalitāsahasranāma* the letter *I* is already *per se* an epithet of the *Devī* and, according to Bhāskararāya, it indicates the *kāmakalā*.[18]

The Goddess is called "Lalitā" ("playful") because the manifestation of the Universe is the expression of her *līlā*. But she is also "Layasarvā" ("she, into whom everything is reabsorbed") and "Layātmikā" ("she who has the nature of reabsorption"). As a matter of fact, as we may read in Kṣemarāja's commentary to the first stanza of the *Spandakārikā*: "The Goddess Consciousness is simultaneously of the nature of display (*unmeṣa*) and suppression (*nimeṣa*)".[19]

The polar nature of the Great Goddess - which is characteristic of all archetypal *imago Dei* - is stressed not only on the cosmogonical level, as we have just seen, but also on the divine one by the juxtaposition of two epithets: "Ambā" ("mother") and "Antakāriṇī" ("she who causes death"). As Zimmer puts it, She is "... the all-inclusive, all-affirmative, all-annihilating death-and-life womb of final peace."[20]

These short remarks already suggest that the hymns composed by epithets are an important tool to understand, on the one side the qualities and the attributes of the divine figure invoked and, on the other side, the theological and philosophical background of the hymn itself. The importance of the *stotras* as a literary genre is quite familiar: they belong to a tradition both ancient and authoritative that goes back to Vedic times, continues in the Epic and in the *Purāṇas* and provides to the medieval *Bhakti* one of its most fitting expressive means. Finally, it may be unnecessary to stress the complexity of the functions, also on

soteriological level, of the divine names and the richness of their symbolism, not only within Hinduism but also in most religious traditions.

The great importance of this literary genre contrasts with the scarcity - in the Western world - of specialised studies in this field and it is to be hoped that ever wider attention will be dedicated to it.

List of Abbreviations

AB	Aitareyabrāhmaṇa
LSN	Lalitāsahasranāma
SK	Spandakārikā
SL	Saundaryalaharī
SP	Śivapurāṇa
TR(JK)	Tripurārahasya (Jñānakhaṇḍa)
TR(MK)	Tripurārahasya (Māhātmyakhaṇḍa)

Notes

1. Goudriaan/Gupta 1981: 58.
2. See TR(JK) 1965: 1 *et passim*.
3. See TR(MK), 53-58.
4. See *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* III,12,26; *Kālikāpurāṇa* I,42 and II,4; *Śivapurāṇa, Rudrasaṃhitā* II,2,23; *Skāndapurāṇa*, 5,2,13, 2-20.
5. See TR(MK), 12.
6. Here starts the 25th *adhyāya*.
7. Later on we find another interesting variant of the Kāma myth.

Thus in the 36th *adhyāya* we read that before facing Śiva, Kāma addressed his thoughts to the Goddess Tripurā, and requested also the help of Lakṣmī. Tripurā appeared and said to Lakṣmī, who was asking her to save her son from the danger that was menacing him, that Kāma's body would have been turned into ashes, but that subsequently he would have obtained a new one. And so Tripurā absorbed Kāma into her own glance and burned his lifeless body; then she multiplied the god and sent one of the 'doubles' (*Pratikāma*) to Śiva. Ever since, for having absorbed Kāma into her eyes, she is known as Kāmākṣī.

The fact that Kāma penetrated Tripurā through her eyes to be reabsorbed (and then regenerated) by her could possibly be recognized as the metaphorical expression of a *regressus ad uterum*. Kāma, uniting with Tripurā - i.e. the Great Mother - returns to the primordial-undifferentiated state. It is meaningful that the *regressus* takes place through the eye, in most cultural traditions a symbolical substitute of the vulva, as psychoanalytical Anthropology has evidenced. The equivalence eye/vulva is again suggested by the sacred iconography, where the sexual union is often metaphorically represented by the glance of the lover penetrating the eyes of the beloved.

At another level this *regressus* recalls also the hierogamic union, where Kāma is at the same time both son and spouse of the Goddess Tripurā-Lakṣmī. This homology of mother and spouse is often stressed in Indian texts, where one says that the husband enters the wife to come out of her as a son (see AB 7,13: 6,7 and SP 5,50:39).

Kāma's return to the primordial state as a necessary requisite to his regeneration and multiplication is also expressed by the fact that he is turned into ashes, which, in the Hindu symbolic system, represent the indifferentiated state that precedes the manifestation of the Universe.

8. For a description and analysis of the *mantra* of the *Śrīvidyā* see, among other texts: the *Lalitāmāhātmya* of the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* (cpt. 38: verses 8-11, 17-32 and 33-62); the commentary by Kāmeśvarasūri to the first stanza of the *Saundaryalaharī* (SL 1937:17-18) and the passages from *Varivasyārahasya* by Bhāskararāya dedicated to the Pañcadaśākṣarī.
9. See Gonda 1965: 115-130 and Goudriaan/Gupta 1981: 59.

10. See SL 1937: 22.
11. Avalon 1913: 45.
12. Puṇyānandanātha 1921: 133.
13. See Abhinavagupta 1975: 69. In his two commentaries to the *Parātriṃśikā*, Abhinavagupta gives the reader a long and detailed explanation of the term. In the longer commentary the explanation is articulated into 16 different interpretations of the term "without superior". See Gnoli 1985.
14. Gnoli 1956: XLVI.
15. See Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa 1979: 115 and 137 (stanzas 37 and 103).
16. LSN 1971: n. 870.
17. See Sarasvatī 1941: 70-71.
18. See LSN 1971: n. 712.
19. SK 1980: 11.
20. Zimmer 1946: 191.

Bibliography

A. Primary Sources.

Abhinavagupta: Parātriṃśikālaghuvṛtti (Anuttaratattvavimarśinī), intr., notes and It. transl. Raniero Gnoli: Commento breve alla Trentina della Suprema, Boringhieri, Torino 1965; ed. and Fr. transl. André Padoux: La Parātriśikālaghuvṛtti de Abhinavagupta, Institut de Civilisation Indienne, Paris 1975.

Aitareyabrāhmaṇa, comm. and Engl. transl. Martin Haug: The Aitareya Brahmanam of the Rigveda (1863), Sudhindra Nath Vasu, Allahabad 1922; Repr.: AMS Press, New York 1974.

Bhāgavatapurāṇa, ed. J.L. Shastri, Engl. transl. and notes Ganesh Vasudeo Tagare: The Bhāgavata-Purāṇa (1976), 5 Vols., Ancient Indian Tradition & Mythology Series, Vols. VII-XI, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1979.

Bhāskararāya: Varivasyārahasya, ed. and Engl. transl. Pandit S. Subrahmanya Sastri (1934): Varivasyā-Rahasya and its Commentary Prakāśa, The Adyar Library and Research Centre, Madras 1976.

Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa: Stavacintāmaṇi, Fr. transl. Lilian Silburn: La Bhakti. Le Stavacintāmaṇi de Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa, Institut de Civilisation Indienne, Paris 1979.

Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa, ed. Kṣemarāja Śrīkṛṣṇadāsa, Veṅkaṭeśvara Press, Bombay 1935; ed. and Engl. transl. Ganesh Vasudeo Tagare: The Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa, Parts I-V, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1984.

Devīmāhātmya, ed. and Engl. transl. Svāmī Jagadīśvarānanda: The Devī-Māhātmyam or Śrī Durgā-Saptaśatī (700 Mantras on Śrī Durgā), Sri Ramakrishna Math, Madras 1953; ed. and Fr. transl. Jean Varenne: Célébration de la Grande Déesse, Les Belles Lettres, Paris 1975.

Kālikāpurāṇa, ed. Śrī Biśwanārāyan Śāstrī, pref. Ācārya Baldeva Upādhyāya, The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi 1972.

Lalitāmāhātmya, ed. and Engl. transl. Ganesh Vasudeo Tagare: The Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa, Parts IV and V, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1984.

Lalitāsahasranāma, Engl. transl. R. Ananthakrishna Sastry (1951): Lalitā-Sahasranāmam, comm. Bhāskararāya, The Theosophical Publishing House, Adyar, Madras 1976; ed. and Engl. transl. S.Y. Krishnaswamy: The Lalitā Sahasranāma, abriged comm. Bhāskararāya, Sankara Educational Trust, Madras 1971.

Puṇyānandanātha: Kāmakalāvilāsa, comm. Naṭanānandanātha, Engl. transl. with comm. Arthur Avalon, Ganesh, Madras 1921, 1971.

Saundaryalaharī, ascribed to Śaṅkarācārya, ed. and Engl. transl. Pandit S. Subrahmanya Sastri and T.R. Srinivasa Ayyangar: Saundarya-Laharī (The Ocean of Beauty) (1937), The Theosophical Publishing House, Adyar, Madras 1977; ed. and Engl. transl. W. Norman Brown: The Saundaryalaharī or Flood of Beauty, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts 1958.

Śivapurāṇa, ed. J.L. Shastri, Engl. transl. by a board of scholars: The Śiva-Purāṇa (1970), 4 Vols., Ancient Indian Tradition & Mythology Series, Vols. I-IV, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1977.

Spandakārikā, ed. and Engl. transl. Jaideva Singh: Spanda-Kārikā. The Divine Creative Pulsation, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1980.

Tripurārahasya (Māhātmyakhaṇḍa), ed. Mukunda Lāla Sāstri, intr. Nārāyan Sāstri Khiste, The Chowkhambha Sanskrit Series Office, Benares 1932.

Tripurārahasya (Jñānakhaṇḍa), comm. Tātparyadīpikā by Śrīnivāsa (1831), intr. Gopinath Kaviraj, Sarasvatī Bhavana Granthamālā XV, Varanaseya Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya, Varanasi 1965; Engl. transl. Swami Sri Ramanananda Saraswathi (Munagala S. Venkataramaiah): Tripura Rahasya or the Mystery beyond the Trinity (1959), Sri Ramanasramam, Tiruvannamalai 1971; ed. and Engl. transl. A.U. Vasavada: Tripurā-Rahasya (Jñānakhaṇḍa), Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi 1965a; ed. and Fr. transl. Michel Hulin: Tripurārahasya (Jñānakhaṇḍa). La doctrine secrète de la Déesse Tripurā (Section de la connaissance), Fayard, Paris 1979.

B. Secondary Sources

Avalon, Arthur: Hymns to the Goddess (1913), Ganesh, Madras 1973.

Gnoli, Raniero: The Aesthetic Experience according to Abhinavagupta, IsMEO, Roma 1956; Second Edition revised, enlarged and re-elaborated by the author, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi 1968.

--- Il commento di Abhinavagupta alla Parātriṃśikā (Parātriṃśikātattvavivaraṇam). Traduzione e testo, IsMEO, Roma 1985.

Gonda, Jan: "The Number Sixteen", in Change and Continuity in Indian Thought, The Hague, 1965, pp. 115-130.

Goudriaan, Teun; Gupta, Sanjukta: Hindu Tantric and Śākta Literature, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 1981.

Sarasvatī, Svāmī Hariharānand: "The Inner Significance of Liṅga-Worship", Journal of the Indian Society of Oriental Art (New Delhi), Vol. IX (1941), pp. 52-80.

Zimmer, Heinrich: Myths and Symbols in Indian Art and Civilisation (1946), ed. Joseph Campbell, Bollingen Series VI, Princeton University Press, Princeton 1974; Fr. transl. Marie-Simone Renou: Mythes et symboles dans l'art et la civilisation de l'Inde, pref. Louis Renou, Payot, Paris 1951.

The cult of Śmaśāna, the realities of Tantrism

Shiníchi Tsuda

1. The name 'cult of *śmaśāna*' or 'cult of cemetery' is meant as a synonym to explain and clarify the popular, but vague word 'tantrism'. The reason I prefer the word 'cult of *śmaśāna*' to tantrism is very simple: the cult itself or the reality of tantrism had been in existence for many centuries before the name or the literature of *tantra* occured; Buddhist *tantras* arose in the first half of the eighth century.

In this short lecture, I would like to examine this 'cult of *śmaśāna*' in three steps: First, I would like to reconfirm the reflections of the cult found in popular literary works within my very limited knowledge; second, I would like to introduce some important references corresponding with them found in Buddhist *tantras* especially in the *Saṁvarodaya-tantra*, which is the earliest and the most important of the *Saṁvara*-literature; and last, I would like to try to find the idea of the reality of these tantrists (or followers of the cult of *śmaśāna*) underlying the cult in its theoretical and historical limitations or conditions.

2. What I call 'the cult of *śmaśāna*' is a diabolical cult of Bhairava, a demonic form of the Great God Śiva, and his consort which was prevalent among the lowest strata of the rural, matriarchal community of the time; it is thought to have been a cult usually performed in a cemetery (*śmaśāna*) by secret societies of the lower class women of rural communities who were regarded as or called themselves *yoginīs* or *ḍākinīs*.

These women assembled in a circle (*yoginī-cakra* or *ḍākinī-jāla*) within a cemetery at midnight on a certain day of the month. They celebrated orgies drinking liquor and eating meat. They sacrificed, even human sacrifice on occasion, to Bhairava for the sake of attaining magical power. They assumed the role of the consort of Bhairava, i.e. Durgā, who is referred to by other names such as Kālī, Cāmuṇḍā, Kālarātri, Śyāmā and so on as the occasion demands, and practised sexual yogic practices surrounding the male object of the practice (*yogin* or *ḍāka*) i.e. the hero (*vīra*), who assumed the role of the lord Bhairava; both experiencing unusual, supreme pleasures (*saṁvara* = *sukha-vara*).

These women were regarded with great aversion and horror by outsiders because of the abominable aspect of their cult based on all the hideous and repulsive elements of the cemetery. At the same time, however, they were awed and revered because of their marvelous attain-

ment of magical power (*siddhi*) and their unusual ecstasy which could only be realized in an exclusive society of the women of that kind.

In the course of time, their sexual yogic practices were systematized to present a general idea of the physical structure of three veins (*nāḍī*) and six nerve centres (*cakra*) within the body, and accordingly, the certainty and universality of the sexual pleasure which was realized through these practices was increased. It was at this stage that a group of Tantric Buddhists, noticing the mental and physiological certainty of the sexual yogic practices of these *yoginīs*, adopted this cult of *śmaśāna* so as to utilize the concrete basis of the cult in order to attain a solid answer to the anxiety caused by the formula of the quick attainment of enlightenment presented in the *Tattvasaṁgraha-tantra*. The formula is presented as the last *mantra* of the so-called five-stepped process of attaining enlightenment (*Pañcākārābhisaṁbodhi-krama*) i.e. "*Oṁ yathā sarvatathāgatās tathāham*" (As all the *tathāgatas* are, so am I). And this mantra was interpreted by the tantrists of the time as follows: 'If the individual existence and the ultimate reality are homologous, they are identical' or 'If the individual existence successfully reorganizes itself to be homologous with the ultimate reality, the former can unite itself with the latter'.

At that time, the male objects (*yogin*) of the sexual practices of these women, who were fundamentally non-clerical and territorial, were the somewhat more professional and migratory practisers of *yoga*, affiliated with the lower sects of Śaivism such as Kāpālikas or Kālāmukhas.

The Buddhist immigrants to the cult of *śmaśāna* tried to take the place of these Śivaite *yogins* leaving the basic structure of the cult, that is, the group of *yoginīs* untouched. Preserving almost all the elements of Bhairava, the god of *śmaśāna*, adding only trivial elements, they created a new, demonic God Heruka, alias Hevajra, who stands trampling his own father Bhairava underfoot assuming almost an identical form.

3. We can feel the atmosphere of this cult of *śmaśāna* in the frame story of the *Vetālapañcaviṁśatikā*. On a moonless night of the fourteenth day of the dark half of the month, Trivikramasena, the brave king of Pratiṣṭhāna, slips out of his castle and comes to the *śmaśāna*, which is the stage of the cult. The evil (perhaps Buddhist) monk Kṣāntiśīla, who schemes to become the emperor of *vidyādharas* by killing the king as a human sacrifice to the *vetāla* in his *śavapūjā*, has made the king, who does not know of his evil intentions, promise to come to the *śmaśāna* that night. The gruesome sight of the *śmaśāna* is depicted as follows by the likeness of the figure of Bhairava, the God Śiva of *śmaśāna*:

"The fearless king comes to the *śmaśāna* which is deep and horrible like the God Bhairava: it is dirty (like the body of the God smeared with ashes of burnt corpses), densely covered with thrilling darkness, with burning fires of the funeral piles glaring like the grim eyes (of the God); it is gruesome (like the body of the God wearing ornaments made of human bones), scattered with countless bones and skeletons, surrounded with a mass of ghosts and *vetālas* delightedly coming together, and with howlings of *mahāśivās*, (big jackals) sounding (like the cry of Mahāśiva, the great God Śiva)."

Later on, the sight of *śmaśāna* comes to be pictured ornamentally as 'eight *śmaśānas*' (*aṣṭaśmaśāna*) forming the outer rim of *maṇḍalas* of the *Saṁvara*-class of *tantras*, which arose to the end of the eighth century. We find a typical description of these 'eight *śmaśānas*' in the *Saṁvaroda-ya-tantra* (ch. XVII) as follows:

vajrapañjaramadhye tu śmaśānāṣṭakabhūṣitam /
caṇḍograṁ gahvarañ caiva vajrajvālākaraṅkinam // 36 //
aṭṭahāsa aiśānyāṁ lakṣmīvana hutāśanam /
ghorāndhakāra nairṛtyāṁ vāyavyāṁ kilikilāravaḥ // 37 //
pūrve śirīṣāśvatthaṁ kaṅkellicūtavṛkṣaṁ viśeṣataḥ /
vaṭakarañjakañ caiva latāparkaṭipārthivam // 38 //
indro dhanadaś caiva nāgendro yamādhipaḥ /
īśāno 'tha hutāśano rākṣasendro 'nilādhipaḥ // 39 //
vāsukis takṣakaś caiva karkoṭakaḥ padma eva ca /
mahāpadmo huluhuluḥ kulikaḥ śaṅkapālakaḥ // 40 //
garjito ghūrṇito ghora āvarto ghana eva ca /
pūraṇaś ca tathā varṣaś caṇḍo meghādhipā ime // 41 //
aparaiś ca vividhaiḥ kākolūkagṛdhraśṛgālaśṛgālikāḥ /
cillicillikāsiṁhamukhavyāghramukhaghorāṇi // 42 //
sarpagomukhaduṇḍubhādicamatkāraiḥ /
kaṅkālaśūlabhinnalambārdhadagdhaśiraḥ // 43 //
kapālajānukavandhadāḍakamuṇḍakair bhīṣaṇāni /
anekasiddhavidyādharaiḥ samayācārayogiyoginīgaṇaiḥ // 44 //
yakṣavetālarākṣasādibhir mahākilikilāyamānair mahāsiddhy-
ṛddhisaṁprāptācāryagaṇaḥ śmaśānamadhye draṣṭavyaḥ // 45 //

"(He should draw the *maṇḍala* which is) adorned with eight cemeteries in the middle of the net of diamonds (*vajrapañjara*); (these cemeteries are named) *Caṇḍogra* ("gruesome and horrible"), *Gahvara* ("the thicket"), *Vajrajvāla* ("diamond-flame") and *Karaṅkin* ("having skeletons") (36). In the north-eastern quarter of fire (south-east), (the cemetery called)

Lakṣmīvana ("the forest of happiness"); in the south-western quarter, (the cemetery called) *Ghorāndhakāra* ("terrible darkness"); and in the quarter of wind (north-west), there is (the cemetery called) *Kilikilārava* ("*kilikilā*-cries of joy") (37).

There are in the east a *śirīśa*-tree, an *aśvattha*-tree, and especially a *kaṅkelli*-tree and a *cūta*-tree, a *vaṭa*-tree and a *karañjaka*-tree, a creeper, a *parkaṭi*-tree and a *pārthiva*-tree (38).

There are (the guardian-deities of the four quarters:) *Indra, Kubera*, the king of serpents (*Varuṇa*) and the Lord Yama; and (the guardian-deities of the four intermediate quarters:) *Iśāna, Agni*, the king of *rākṣasas* (*Nairṛti*) and the lord of wind (*Vāyu*) (39).

There are (the kings of serpents:) *Vāsuki, Takṣaka, Karkoṭaka, Padma, Mahāpadma, Huluhulu, Kulika* and *Śaṅkapālaka* (40).

(There are clouds) roaring, shaking, terrible, whirling and thick, filling and likewise raining and violent; these are the lords of clouds (41).

And, there are other various horrible creatures (such as) a crow, an owl, a vulture, a jackal and a she-jackal, a hawk and a she-hawk, a "lion-faced" and a "tiger-faced" (creature) (42), together with (other) surprising (creatures such as) a snake, a "cow-faced" and a lizard and so on.

There are skeletons, (dead bodies) split by spears, (dead bodies) hanging down (from trees), (dead bodies) half burnt and (severed) heads (43); (these cemeteries are) terrifying (being filled) with skulls, knees, large bellies, (heads showing) tusks and bald heads.

Together with many *siddhas* and *vidyādharas*, troops of *yogins* and *yoginīs* equipped with the practice of *samaya* (44), *yakṣas*, *vetālas, rākṣasas* and so on who are roaring with *kilikilā*-laughter, a group of teachers (*ācārya*) who have attained great fulfilment and supernatural power is to be seen in the middle of the eight cemeteries (45)."

It is these *samayācārayogiyoginīs* (troops of *yogins* and *yoginīs* who keep the vows of the cult of *śmaśāna*) that we find in sanskrit literature as the followers of the cult of *śmaśāna*.

4. The cult of *śmaśāna* appears as early as in the first story of the *Vetālapañcaviṁśatikā*. Vajramukuṭa, the prince of Vārāṇasī, comes to Kaliṅga to obtain beautiful Padmāvatī, daughter of the *dantaghāṭaka* Saṁgrāmavardhana who is a court favourite of the king of Kaliṅga. As an infant son of the king has accidentally died at the time, Buddhiśarīra, the clever friend of the prince conceives of a plan. He makes the prince slip into the room of the girl, make her drunk and sleep, put a brand on her buttock with a burnt trident, and steal her precious necklace. The next

morning, he sends the prince to the market and makes him pretend to openly sell the necklace, and he himself goes to the *śmaśāna*, disguised as an ascetic (*tāpasa*). The prince is easily caught by the police searching for the stolen necklace of Padmāvatī, and is investigated by the magistrate. The prince asserts that his master (*guru*) has given him the necklace, and that the *guru* is the one who should be investigated. Buddhiśarīra plausibly tells the magistrate, who comes to the *śmaśāna* as he has expected, as follows:

> "Being an ascetic (*tapasvin*) and always wandering about in this or that forest, I came to this city by chance. As I was sitting in this *śmaśāna* at night, I saw *yoginīs*, assembling in this place from far and near, form a *yoginī-cakra*. As I watched, a *yoginī* took the young prince to the center of the circle, cut his chest, took out the heart-lotus of the boy and offered it to the God Bhairava.
>
> In due time, the woman of great magical power (*mahāmāyā*), who was drunk, came to me with frowning, menacing expressions on her face, and tried to snatch my rosary with which I was muttering *mantras*. Displeased with her excessive rudeness, I flamed the points of this trident by pronouncing *mantras* and put a brand on her buttock with it. This is the necklace that I snatched from the woman on that occasion."

Informed of the case by the magistrate, the king of Kaliṅga investigates and finds out that the brand of the trident really exists on the buttock of *Padmāvatī*. In the belief that his son was killed and eaten by the *ḍākinī*, he expells her from the city, following the advice of Buddhiśarīra. Vajramukuṭa and Buddhiśarīra, now casting off the guise of ascetics, wait for her on the way and happily take her back to Vārāṇasī.

We find another story similar to this one in the sixth chapter of the *Daśakumāracarita* of Daṇḍin. Kalahakaṇṭaka, a youth of Mathurā, obtains by a crafty design Nitambavatī, the beautiful, chaste wife of a famous leader of merchants in Ujjayinī called Anantakīrti. He first asks the influential people of Ujjayinī to make him watchman of the *śmaśāna* of the city and gets the position. One night, he disguises himself as a *mantravādin* and calls Nitambavatī to a garden. Then, he takes a golden anklet from her leg, scratches her on the groin with a knife, and runs away. The following day, he takes the anklet to the union of merchants and tells them a false story:

"As you know, I have been given the position of a watchman of the *śmaśāna* by you and I live on this job. In these days, there are greedy people who come to the cemetery at night to burn the corpses without paying the fee; therefore, recently I have been staying in the *śmaśāna* even in the night time. Last night, I saw a woman assuming the figure of Śyāmā (*śyāmākā-rāṁ nārīm apaśyam*) pulling a half-burnt corpse out of the funeral fire. As I tried to catch her, fighting fear with hope of reward, I accidentally scratched her on the groin with a knife. At that moment, this anklet came off her leg; the woman did not lose this opportunity and escaped from my hands, leaving this anklet behind. This is how I got this anklet, and I willingly leave it to your discretion."

After much discussion, people come to the conclusion that Nitambavatī is a *śākinī*. Deserted by her husband and overcome by despair, Nitambavatī comes to the *śmaśāna* to commit suicide. Kalahakaṇṭaka frankly explains the situation to her and takes her back to his home in Mathurā.

The point of this story lies in the expression "*śyāmākārāṁ nārīm apaśyam*", which may be translated as: "I saw a woman of dark complexion", or "I saw a dark shadow of a woman". However, I would like to take it as a *bahuvrīhi*-compound *śyāmā-ākārām*, a woman with the figure of Śyāmā, an epithet of the Goddess Durgā. It must have made one shudder to see a woman of such figure pulling a half-burnt corpse from a funeral fire in a *śmaśāna* at night, for he would have instantly known what kind of a woman she was. *Śākinī* is a female demon or a witch of the same kind as *ḍākinī*, attending the Goddess Durgā.

The name of the country Ujjayinī reminds us of the *Mālatīmādhava* of Bhavabhūti, which is known to refer the cult of *kāpālikas*. Roaming about a *śmaśāna* at night, Mādhava finds by accident his love Mālatī, the daughter of Bhūrivasu who is a minister of the king of Ujjayinī; she has been kidnapped by Aghoraghaṇṭa, a *kāpālika* who has recently come from Śrīparvata and settled in this *śmaśāna*, and his female attendant Kapāla-kuṇḍalā for a sacrifice to the Goddess Karālā of the *śmaśāna*. As Aghoraghaṇṭa, drawing a sword to kill Mālatī, says, "O adorable Goddess Cāmuṇḍā, please eat this sacrifice I offer you according to the ritual of *mantra* (*cāmuṇḍe bhagavati mantrasādhanādāv uddiṣṭām upanihitāṁ bhajasva pūjām*), Mādhava rushes out to save Mālatī. He fights with Aghoraghaṇṭa, calling him "wretched *kāpālika*" (*kāpālikā-pasada*) or "heretical *caṇḍāla*" (*pākhaṇḍacaṇḍāla*), whereas the latter calls the former "a green horn *brāhmaṇa*" (*brāhmaṇaṣimbha*). Kapāla-kuṇḍalā, who has been very active in kidnapping Mālatī from the sky, is the former Saudāminī, a

brāhmaṇical female disciple of Kāmandakī; she has degraded herself from brāhmaṇical caste to the outcaste milieu of kāpālikas and has obtained, in return, great magical powers, such as the ability to travel in the sky.

These elements shown in the *Mālatīmādhava* take us back to the above-mentioned *Saṁvarodaya-tantra*.

5. The name of the Goddess Cāmuṇḍā appears in following two mantras, one for *vaśīkaraṇa* (charming) and the other for *uccāṭana* (expelling), found in the twenty-fourth chapter of the *Saṁvarodaya* in the name *Karmaprasarauṣadhiprayoganirdeśa-paṭala* (the chapter of various magical practices and prescriptions of various kinds of medical plants):

> *Oṁ cāmuṇḍe dhūmakeśi vidyujjihve hana hana paca paca devadattam ānaya svāhā.*
> "Oṁ *Cāmuṇḍā*! the Goddess with the hair of the colour of smoke! the Goddess with the tongue of lightning! kill! kill! burn! burn! lead such and such person near to me! *svāhā*."

> *Oṁ namo bhagavati śuṣkamukhi cāmuṇḍe ciri miri pātake amukaṁ vaśam ānaya svāhā.*
> "Oṁ, salute to you, O reverend Goddess! the Goddess of parched mouth! *Cāmuṇḍā*! *ciri*! *miri*! O woman who makes (the caste) degrade! make such and such person subdued! *svāhā*."

The following *mantra* which comes at the beginning of this chapter tells us the fact that the magical practices shown in this chapter belong to the cult of *śmaśāna*:

> *Oṁ namaḥ śmaśānavāsine mahākālānucarāya // tad yathā // Oṁ cala pracala lala lālaya devaliṅgaṁ svāhā.*
> "Oṁ I salute to the one that lives in the *śmaśāna*, that obeys the God Mahākāla. Oṁ move! treble! sport! make the *liṅga* of the God sport! *svāhā*."

6. It is more notable that the words *karālī* and *kapālinī* are found in the description of the *maṇḍala* in the thirteenth and most important chapter of the *Saṁvarodaya*, that is, the *Herukodayanirdeśa-paṭala* (the chapter of the explanation of the origination of the God Heruka), which obviously reflects the real state of the orgiastic assembly of the followers of the cult of *śmaśāna*:

ravimaṇḍalamadhyasthaṁ śrīherukaṁ vibhāvayet /
trimukhaṁ ṣaḍbhujaṁ vīram ālīdhāsanasaṁsthitam // 15 //
mūlamukhaṁ mahākṛṣṇaṁ dakṣiṇaṁ kundasannibham /
vāmaṁ raktamahābhīmaṁ jaṭāmakuṭabhūṣitam // 16 //
bhairavakālarātrin tu ākramya mahāsukhe sthitam /
vajravairocanīñ cāliṅgya karuṇārāgamahotsavaiḥ // 17 //
vajraghaṇṭāsamāpannam āliṁganabhujadvayam /
dvitīyabhujadvayena gajacarmāmbaradharaṁ param // 18 //
tṛtīyaḍamarukaṁ vādyaṁ sarvadharmasvabhāvataḥ /
vāmatṛtīyakareṇa khaṭvāṁgakapāladharam // 19 //
kapālamālālaṁkṛtaśekharam ardhacandravibhūṣitam /
viśvavajrāṁkitaṁ mūrdhni kulādhipatimastakam // 20 //
vikṛtānanaṁ mahābhīmaṁ śṛṁgārarasānvitam /
nivasanaṁ vyāghracarmeṇa śatārdhanaraśiravibhūṣitam // 21 //
pañcamudrādharaṁ devaṁ navanāṭyarasānviam /
tasyāliṁgitā bhagavatī dvibhujā ekavaktrā trinetrā // 22 //
bandhūkavarṇā nagnā ca khaṇḍamaṇḍitamekhalā /
muktakeśī *karālī* ca sravanti rudhirapriyā // 23 //
vāmabhujāliṁgitakapālā duṣṭamārādyasṛgdharā /
dakṣine tarjanīvajraṁ kalpāgnivanmahātanuḥ /
jaṁghādvayena samāveṣṭā mahāsukharatā sadā // 24 //
ḍākinī tu tathā lāmā khaṇḍarohā tu rūpiṇī /
nyaset padmadiśāsthāne sarvasiddhisukhodayaḥ // 25 //
kṛṣṇā śyāmā ca raktā ca gauravarṇā trilocanaḥ /
dvibhujā ekavaktrās tu khaṭvāṁgakara*kapālinī* // 26 //
dakṣiṇe vajrakarttāra ālīḍhapadanagnikāḥ /
muktakeśā daṁṣṭravadanāḥ pañcamudrāvibhūṣitāḥ // 27 //
vidikṣu ca catvāro bodhicittādibhāṇḍakāḥ /
pūjayet pañcāmṛtayutaṁ nṛtyagītasukhotsavam // 28 //

"He should imagine the auspicious *Heruka* situated in the midst of the solar disc. He is the hero, three-faced, six-armed and standing in the posture of *ālīḍha* (15). His central face is deep black; his right face is like a *kunda*-flower; and his left face is red and very terrible, and is adorned with a crest of twisted hair (16). Treading on *Bhairava* and *Kālarātri*, he abides in the great pleasure (*mahāsukha*), embracing *Vajravairocanī* in great rejoicing of desire of compassion (17). He has attained concentration of mind through the union of a *vajra* and a bell, embracing (the Goddess) with his (first) two arms (18). He holds in the right hand of his third pair (of arms) a *ḍamaru*-drum to be sounded according to the nature of all the *dharmas*, and he has a *khaṭvāṁga*-staff and a *kapāla*-vessel in his third left hand (19). His crown is decorated

with a wreath of skulls, and is adorned with a crescent moon. He is marked with a cross-*vajra* on his head and has the lord of the family (*Akṣobhya*) on the top of the head (20). His face is distorted; he is very terrible and assumed the erotic-*rasa*. He has a tigerskin as his garment and is adorned with fifty human heads (21). He is the god having five *mudrās*, and is possessed of nine *rasas* of dancing. The goddess embraced by him has two arms, one face and three eyes (22). She is of the colour of a *bandhūka*-flower, naked, and with a girdle decorated by pieces (of *kapāla*), with hair loosened, showing tusks, dribbling and fond of blood (23). In her left arm, she holds a vessel made of a human skull containing the blood of evil *māras* and so on. Her right hand in the *tarjanī*-posture holds a *vajra*; her big body is like the fire at the end of a *kalpa*. She always enjoys the great pleasure clasping (the god *Heruka*) tightly in her two thighs (24).

There are *Ḍākinī*, and likewise *Lāmā*, *Khaṇḍarohā* and *Rūpiṇī*. He should put them on the places of lotus(-petals) (corresponding to the) four directions; pleasure of all (kinds of) *siddhi* will (then) appear (25). They are of black, green, red and white colour respectively; and each of them has three eyes, two arms and one face. They are *kapālinīs* holding *khaṭvāṁga*-staves in their (left) hands (26), and *vajra*-swords in their right (hands). They are naked and in the posture of *ālīḍha*, with hair loosened, with mouths showing tusks, and are adorned with five *mudrās* (27).

There are four receptacles of *bodhicitta* and so on on the (four lotus-petals of) intermediate quarters. He should worship with a happy feast of song and dance accompanied by five *amṛtas* (28)" (SU 13,15-28)..

7. The circle of *yoginīs* or *ḍākinīs* (*yoginī-cakra* or *ḍākinī-jāla*) on the basis of which this orgiastic assembly is held is imagined to be composed originally of eight members surrounding the male object (*yogin*) and the central woman who is the partner of the sexual yogic practice of the male object. The surrounding eight women are also imagined to practise sexual *yoga* with the central *yogin* shifting in rotation to the centre of the circle; this phenomenon is alluded to by the word *sañcāra* (translocation).

This original form of eight yoginīs surrounding a male object and his consort is exactly reflected on the *Heruka-maṇḍala* of the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinīmāyāsaṁvara-tantra* which tells the birth of the God Heruka; the names of the eight *yoginīs* surrounding the new Buddhist God Heruka in union with his consort Krodheśvarī are as follows:

east	Gaurī
south	Caurī
west	Pramohā
north	Vetālī
southeast	Pukkasī
northwest	Caṇḍālī
northeast	Śme śā (= Rajakī)

These names tell us the fact that the women of the cult of *śmaśāna* were originally the women of the lowest class to whom the magical power (*siddhi*) is thought to be belonging.

The form of original *yoginī-cakra* is also found in the outer circle of the *maṇḍala* of the *Hevajra-tantra*, the Buddhism of *śmaśāna*. The members are as follows:

east	Gaurī
south	Caurī
west	Vetālī
north	Ghasmarī
southeast	Śavarī
southwest	Caṇḍālī
northwest	Ḍombī
northeast	Pukkasī

8. The *Hevajra-tantra* established itself as the Buddhism of *śmaśāna* by newly introducing the newly organized group of five *yoginīs* to the centre of the original group of eight *yoginīs*; names of five *yoginīs* who are premised to be identical with the five families of *tathāgatas* of the *Vajradhātu-maṇḍala* (the *maṇḍala* of the adamantine sphere, the ultimate reality of the *Tattvasaṁgraha-tantra*) are as follows:

centre	Brāhmaṇī (= *Tathāgata*-family)
east	Ḍombī (= *Vajra*-family)
south	Caṇḍālinī (= *Ratna*-family)
west	Nartī (= *Padma*-family)
north	Rajakī (= *Karma*-family)

Among these names, the central name Brāhmaṇī tells us that there existed women of the upper classes of the cities, like Padmāvatī of the Vetālapañcaviṁśatikā, Nitambavatī of the *Daśakumāracarita* and Saudāminī of the *Mālatīmādhava*, who secretly joined the society of *yoginīs* at the risk of the degradation of their own castes, being attracted by the

magical power or the unusual sexual pleasure which is expected to be attained there.

9. The replacement of the five families of the *Vajradhātu-maṇḍala* with the newly organized group of five *yoginīs* or *mudrās*, which is shown in the following passage of the *Hevajra-tantra* (HV.I.v.4-8), has established, for the first time, the methodological foundation of the *tantric* idea of quick attainment of enlightenment:

mudrāḥ pañcakulānīti kathyate mokṣahetunā /
vajreṇa mudryate 'nena mudrā tenābhidhīyate // 4 //
vajrapadmaṁ tathā karma tathāgataṁ ratnam eva ca /
kulāni pañcavidhāny āhur uttamāni mahākṛpa // 5 //
vajraṁ ḍombī bhaven mudrā padmaṁ nartī tathaiva ca /
karma rajakī samākhyātā brāhmaṇī ca tathāgatī // 6 //
ratnaṁ caṇḍālinī jñeyā pañcamudrā viniścitāḥ /
tathāgatakulaṁ caitat saṁkṣepenābhidhīyate // 7 //
tathatāyā gataḥ śrīmān āgataś ca tathaiva ca /
anayā prajñayā yuktyā tathāgato 'bhidhīyate // 8 //

"The fact that the five *mudrās* (which constitute the newly organized group of *yoginīs*) are nothing other than the five families (of *tathāgatas* constituting the *Vajradhātu-maṇḍala* of the *Tattvasaṁgraha-tantra*) is declared to be the cause of (attaining) liberation. She (that is, a *yoginī*) is called *mudrā* or sign as she is signed with an adamant (*vajra*) (4).

Vajra, *Padma*, *Karma*, *Tathāgata* and *Ratna* are said to be the five highest kinds of families, O you of great compassion (5)!

The *mudrā* Ḍombī is (nothing other than) the *Vajra*(-family), and likewise, (the *mudrā*) Nartī is (nothing other than) the *Padma*(-family). (The *mudrā*) Rajakī is said to be (nothing other than) the *Karma*(-family), and (the *mudrā*) Brāhmaṇī is (the *mudrā* who is nothing other than) the *Tathāgata*(-family) (6). Caṇḍālinī is known to be (nothing other than) the *Ratna*(-family). (Thus,) five families are set down. In short, (the whole of) this (world of reality which is the aggregate of these five *mudrās* or five families) is (nothing other than the centre of the world i.e.) the *Tathāgata*(-family) (7). (The Lord Hevajra,) the auspicious one, who has gone to reality (*tathatā*), and who has come back from (the reality) is called *tathāgata* because he is united with *prajñā* (the wisdom of enlightenment which is at the same time a woman called *mudrā* or an aggregate of those *mudrās*, that is, *yoginī-cakra* itself) (8)."

This passage also tells us the idea of the reality of Tantric Buddhists. These *yoginīs* or *ḍākinīs* are originally terrible, dangerous existences; men who carelessly approach them may be killed or devoured by them. However, if one can appease them in due method and successfully practise sexual union with them, they suddenly change to the goddesses of mercy and make him experience the state of the unusual supreme pleasure (*saṁvara*) which is nothing other than the state of enlightenment.

10. This fact reveals us the speciality of the idea of reality of these Tantric Buddhists; it is the state in which 'the bipolar structure of *avidyā* and *vidyā* of the *dharma* of feminine singular' has dissolved its bipolarity and the contrary *avidyā* and *vidyā* are ambivalently constituting the substance of the reality. However, as long as 'the bipolar structure of *avidyā* and *vidyā* of the *dharma* of feminine singular' is the one and only truth of existence found by the Buddha himself, how is it possible for the structure to be specialized to the ambivalence of *avidyā* and *vidyā*?

As was expected, the *Hevajra-tantra* suddenly reverses its own *tantric* scheme of quick attainment of enlightenment through the sexual union with the circle of *yoginīs* (which was once premised by the *Hevajra-tantra* to be nothing other than *prajñā-pāramitā*, the wisdom of enlightenment, the one aspect of the *dharma* of feminine singular, that is, the reality) by setting up the stage of a fourth consecration (the consecration of *vācā*) further than the third, *prajñājñāna*-consecration, the consecration attaining the wisdom (*jñāna*) of enlightenment through the sexual union with *prajñā* or *mudrā*, the woman of the cult of *śmaśāna*.

The following sentences found at the end of the *Hevajratantra* are thought to be the truth given in the fourth consecration (*caturtha-abhiṣeka*):

idaṁ jñānaṁ mahāsūkṣmaṁ vajramaṇḍaṁ nabhopamam /
virajaṁ mokṣadaṁ śāntaṁ pitā te tvam asi svayam //
"This wisdom is very subtle; it is the cream of the adamant and is like the empty sky.
It is free from the dust (of *tantric* sexual practices), brings about liberation in the true sense of the word and is tranquil. You are yourself your own father." (HV.II.xii.4).

Once the truth is given in words, it urges us to the practice which leads us to the truth itself. At this fourth consecration of the *Hevajra-tantra*, the history of Tantric Buddhism turns 'critically' to the *Saṁvara*-tantrism. And, what we find there is the practice of pilgrimage of *pīṭhas*

which is nothing but the restoration of the idea of the lifelong *brahmacaryā*, which has been taught by the Buddha himself from the beginning of Buddhism on the foundation of the truth of existence, that is, 'the bipolar structure of *avidyā* and *vidyā* of the *dharma* of feminine singular'. This fact is also reflected on the form of the *Saṁvara-maṇḍala* of sixty-two deities which has recovered the form of 'the double structure of the realm of reality', the form which necessarily results from the truth of existence.

Vaśīkaraṇa texts in Sanskrit Kāmaśāstra literature

Gyula Wojtilla

Tracing Tantric elements in non-Tantric literature and pursuing Tantric tradition in the frame of Indian cultural history are fields of research where a great deal of things still are to be done. The present paper is going to examine some Tantric elements wrapped in a non-Tantric context. It is a pilot study of those portions of Kāmaśāstras that bear on one of the six acts, called *vaśīkaraṇa*.

These texts consist of *mantras* (spells addressed to special deities) and a prescription how to apply them. In a broader sense of the term, this magical practice can be regarded as a kind of *abhicāra* i.e. "sorcery" (cf. Türstig 1985, 82), therefore the passages involved give a modest contribution to our incomplete knowledge about magic and sorcery in India also.

Specialized *vaśīkaraṇa* in order to subjugate women is common in the responsible texts of the Atharvaveda, Kauśikasūtra and later in the Purāṇic sources and in the Ṣaṭkarma monographs (Goudriaan 1978, 327-332); even the excellent 18th-century encyclopaedia named Śivatattvaratnākara treats the subject at length (I, 652-654). However, the corresponding texts in the Sanskrit writings on love escaped the interest of scholars.

Here I want to discuss the relevant texts in a chronological order. For this purpose I selected a special group of texts that share a common feature, namely the deity invoked in them is Cāmuṇḍā or one of her forms. Before doing that, it is necessary to mention that this role of Cāmuṇḍā is fairly noticeable in Sanskrit sources of another kind, too.

There are illustrative instances in the Agnipurāṇa (323,15): *oṁ uttiṣṭha cāmuṇḍe jabhaya jambhaya mohaya mohaya amukaṁ vaśam ānaya ānaya svāhā* i.e. "*Oṁ*, O Cāmuṇḍā, stand up, snap at him, snap at him, stupefy him stupefy him, lead lead N.N. into my dominance, hail!". The Siddhanāgārjunakakṣapuṭa, 6,3 (cf. Goudriaan 1978, 302) reads: *turu turu*, attract N.N., *hrīṁ svāhā* i.e. "Be quick be quick, attract N.N., *hrīṁ*, hail!". The spell should be recited ten thousand times before becoming effective. A modern collection of spells, Mantrasiddhi by name, edited by Rājeś Dikṣit and sold in the bazaars in the Hindi belt of India contains the following mantra:

oṁ Cāmuṇḍe tarutanu amukāya karṣaya ākarṣaya svāhā "*Oṁ*, O Cāmuṇḍā, overcome her, make her emaciated, attract her, attract her to N.N., hail!". In addition there stands the prescription how to employ it: *is mantra kā ikkīs din tak tīnoṅ sandhyākāl meṅ ek-ek hazār jap karnā*

cāhie. Mantra meṁ jahāṅ amukāya śabd prayog huā hai, vahāṅ abhilāṣit strī ke nām kā uccāraṇ karṇā cāhie: "One should mutter this spell for twenty-one days at the three *sandhyās* one-one thousand times. One should pronounce the name of the woman longed for at the place where the word "*amukāya*" is used."

Now let us make a review of the *Kāmaśāstras* proper. The Ratirahasya or Kokaśāstra is a text of the 12th-14th centuries. R. Schmidt dates it back to a period preceding the 14th century (Schmidt 1902, 63), while W.C. Archer makes its author flourish in the twelfth century (Archer 1964, 14). It contains the following spell:

oṁ Cāmuṇḍe hula hula cula cula vaśam ānayāmukīṁ svāhā; abhimantrya saptavarāṁ praṇavādir ayaṁ vaśīkaraṇam. In R. Schmidt's German translation it stands as: *Oṁ* Cāmuṇḍā komm komm (?)! Versenke, versenke (?)! Bringe die und die in meine Botmässigkeit *svāhā*! Siebenmal damit besprochen, wirkt dieser Spruch mit *oṁ* an der Spitze als Mittel zum Gefügigmachen". With certain modifications, I would offer the following English translation: "*Oṁ*, O Cāmuṇḍā, go go (read: *hola hola*), or: make amorous gestures (2x), or: *hulahuli* (a kind of exclamation). Lead N.N. into my dominance, hail! Having muttered it seven times, this is a subjugation beginning with the sacred syllable *oṁ*."

Pañcasāyaka, next in age after the Kokaśāstra, belongs probably to the first half of the 14th century (Archer 1964, 81). R. Schmidt places it in the 13th century (Schmidt 1902, 52), while Krishnamachariar is of the opinion that the author Kaviśekharācārya was a friend of king Harisiṃha of Simroan who ruled about 1324 A.D. (Krishnamachariar 1974, 650). The text contains two mantras. The first one:

Oṁ Cāmuṇḍe jaya Cāmuṇḍe mohaya amukīṃ vaśam ānaya svāhā. Asya mantrasya japo lakṣam ekam. madiramiśritapalāśakusumair homaḥ. sarvaṁ vāmahastena kartavyam.

daṁṣṭrākoṭiviśaṅkaṭā suvadanā sāndrāndhakāre sthitā
khaṭvāṅgāśanigūḍhadakṣiṇakarā vāme sapāśaṃ śiraḥ |
śyāmā piṅgalamūrdhajā bhayakarī śārdūlacarmāmbarā
Cāmuṇḍā śavavāhinī japavidhau dhyeyā sadā sādhakaiḥ ||

"*Oṁ*, O Cāmuṇḍā, be victorious! O Cāmuṇḍā, stupefy N.N., lead her into my dominance, hail! This spell is to be muttered one hundred thousand and one times. The oblation consists of *palāśa* flowers (Butea frondosa) blended with spirituous liquor. Everything must be done with the left hand. During the act of muttering the spell, the officiating persons should always meditate on Cāmuṇḍā as a ghastly one with ten million teeth, having a nice face, standing in dense darkness, with her right hand concealed by the khaṭvāṅga, with a snared skull in the left hand, dark-

coloured, having reddish brown hair, dreadful, having a dress made of tiger skin, riding on a corpse".

The second mantra reads thus:

oṁ namo namaś Cāmuṇḍe hili hili amukīṁ vaśam ānaya svāhā. asya mantrasya ekalakṣajapaḥ. madiramiśritapalāśakusumair homaḥ. sarvaṁ vāmahastena kartavyam.

vaktrāsaktaśarāsanā trinayanā savyetare sāṅkuśam
vāmenāpi kareṇa pāśam urasi nyastottamāṅgasrajā /
vyāmuktorukucā karālavadanā vahniprabhāmadhyagā
dhyeyā japavidhau narair iti sadā viśveśvarī siddhaye //

"*Om* salutation, salutation, O Cāmuṇḍā! be wanton, be wanton, lead N.N. into my dominance, hail! This spell is to be muttered one hundred thousand times. The oblation is of *palāśa* flowers blended with spirituous liquor. Everything must be done with the left hand. During the act of muttering the spell for the sake of universal success, people should always meditate on Viśveśvarī as one holding a bow in front of her face, having three eyes, with a hook in the right hand, holding a snare in the left hand, with a necklace made of skulls on her breasts, with thighs and breasts set free, with a dreadful face, proceeding in the middle of the glow of a fire".

The Smaradīpikā, a text which probably dates from the 14th century (Archer 1964, 46), presents an instruction:

tricāmuṇḍe iti padaṁ tataḥ kvanu kvanu smṛtam /
tataḥ padaṁ chanu chanu svakīyaṁ vaśam ānayet //

"O Cāmuṇḍā" three times, thus the word; then "jingle jingle" (?) is mentioned; then the word *chanuchanu* (?) must lead N.N. into one's own dominance".

The Anaṅgaraṅga of Kalyāṇamalla dates from the first decades of the 16th century (Archer 1964, 86). The relevant spell reads as follows:

oṁ Cāmuṇḍe mohayātha vaśatāṁ naya cāmukīm /
svāhā padānta ity uktaś cāmuṇḍāmantra uttamaḥ //
palāśakusumair etal lakṣaṁ japtvā daśāṁśataḥ /
homena vāmavidhinā sarvasiddhiṁ pravindati //
iti mantreṇa japtāni saptadhā kusumāni ca /
dattāni vaśagāṁ kuryuḥ kāminīṁ kusumāni ca //

"*Oṁ* O Cāmuṇḍā! stupefy N.N. and lead her into my dominance. The word "hail" is at the end of the mantra. This Cāmuṇḍāmantra is said to be the best one. Having muttered it one hundred thousand times with oblation of only one tenth of this number performed in a reverse manner one reaches universal success. The flowers muttered over seven times with this spell and given to the affectionate woman may make her subjugated".

The Śṛṅgārarasaprabandhadīpikāmañjarī, a text of uncertain age, has a mantra addressed to Mahākālī, a form of Cāmuṇḍā (cf. Liebert 1976, 158):
hrīṁ lūṁ Mahākāli holi holi klūṁ tadīyadehaṁ madanānītena tāpaya tāpaya śoṣaya śoṣaya madabhimukhaṁ kuru kuru svāhā. iti puṣpāni mantrayitvā dadyād vaśyā bhavati.
"*Hrīṁ, lūṁ*, O Mahākālī! go, go, *klūṁ*! burn burn, dry up, dry up her body by bringing her to passion, make make her face turned towards me. Having muttered the spell in this manner, one should present flowers. The woman will be subjugated".

The Ratikallolinī, also a text of unknown date, refers to a mantra of Cāmuṇḍā and its application:

lakṣam ekaṁ japen mantram āgamoktavidhānataḥ /
daśāṁśaṁ juhuyād brahmavṛkṣakaiḥ kusumair api //
puṣpāni saptadhānena mantritāni yathāvidhi /
dattāni kuryur vaśagāṁ kāminīṁ nātra saṁśayaḥ //

"One should mutter the spell one hundred thousand and one times according to the rule set by the Āgamas and should sacrifice for one-tenth part of that number by means of flowers born in the *palāśa* tree. The seven kinds of flowers muttered above with that spell according to the rule must make the affectionate woman subjugated. There is no doubt."

The love-spells listed above belong to the type of spells for "subduing a lover"; there is no example of the type applied for "regaining a lost lover" or "cursing a lover who had previously abandoned his or her partner".

As to the language and style of these texts, some remarks are in order. Their unidiomatic character is quite visible. The imperatives addressed to the deity invoked occupy the central part of the texts. The repetition of the root vowel like *hili hili* instead of the grammatically correct *hila hila* is due to the injunction to repeat the spell many times. We have to do with orthographical problems, too: *cula cula* stands perhaps for *culla culla*. The form *hula* might be a substitute for the correct *hola*, or it may stand for a *hulahuli*, i.e. a kind of exclamation. Functionally, these repeated imperatives serve as tools of magic power capable of accomplishing the wished object.

The ambivalent character of Tantric deities is well-known (Goudriaan 1979, 63) and this phenomenon is likewise valid for Cāmuṇḍā. She is benevolent and removes the obstacles before the efficacy of a mantra. She is invoked to restore a maiden to life in a story of the Kathāsaritsāgara (ch. LXX, cf. Tawney/Penzer, The Ocean of Story, IV, 149), where she is addressed thus: "O Thou of the loud laugh adorned with a garland of skulls not to be gazed on, Cāmuṇḍā the terrible goddess, assist me

quickly!" In the story of the *brāhmaṇa* Vīravara, a man who had sacrificed his son to Cāmuṇḍā in order to rescue the life of a king and who was ready to cut off his own head for the same purpose, there is the following invocation: "Honour to Thee ... that givest security to Thy votaries, rescue me who am plunged in the mire of the world, who appeals to Thee for protection ..." (Kathāsaritsāgara ch. LIX, cf. The Ocean of Story, IV, 1979-180). She appears as one of the favourite deities of the early Cāḷukya kings (cf. Mahalingam 1967, 28); the Śrī-Cāmuṇḍeśvarī temple in Mysore speaks of her role as tutelary deity of the local dynasties in the medieval times in and around that city (cf. Fodor's Guide 1971, 557).

Nevertheless, Cāmuṇḍā the life-giving mother has also been associated with death (Bhattacharji 1978, 89). Ultimately birth and death meet in the personified earth in the Mother Goddess and her aspects such as in the person of Cāmuṇḍā. The connection between love, especially sexual love, and death is often reiterated both in textual and popular traditions in India. The funeral procession of an old person is described as the second marriage party accompanied by erotic dances (Parry 1985, 52).

There is archaeological evidence of Cāmuṇḍā's presence in the Kāpālika cult from the eighth century Orissa. The Vaitāl temple in Bhubaneshwar allegedly has Cāmuṇḍā as its presiding deity. The Svarṇādrimahodaya states that Cāmuṇḍā was worshipped there in the terrific form called Kapālinī. As a matter of fact there are dreadful deities sculptured around the inner shrine and a panel of erotic couples between the walls and roof. According to Lorenzen this circumstance seems to indicate Tantric impact (Lorenzen, 1972, 30).

It is noteworthy that Cāmuṇḍā has also the name Karālī or Karālā i.e. "who has projecting teeth". Strikingly, in Dāmodaragupta's Kuṭṭanīmata, a text from the eighth century, the chief heroine who is a kuṭṭanī, i.e. a procuress or bawd, bears the name Vikarālā. She is the very image of Cāmuṇḍā: she has very large teeth and a low chin. Her body looks emaciated. She has solemn red eyes and the lobes of her ears hang down loosely, the veins on her neck are prominent. She possesses a cosmic wisdom, so it is no wonder that she is able to mastermind brilliant plans for the beautiful young courtezan named Mālatī.

Similarly the key figure of Kṣemendra's Samayamātṛkā is shaped after Cāmuṇḍā. Even the invocation of the work deserves attention:

tām ajñātaviśālakālakalanāṁ tais taiḥ purāṇair api
prauḍhāṁ dehisamūhamohanamayīṁ Kālīṁ karālāṁ numaḥ //

"We praise that Kālī as Karālā (i.e. who has projecting teeth), the bold woman who created delusion for the multitude of men and whose influence on the extensive time is not known even by the various ancient

scriptures. The bawd has the telling name Kaṅkālī "the Skeleton-lady". She has long dreadful teeth; her bones and veins show through her skin.

Kṣemendra openly compares her either with Kālī who has a top of hair (*śikhā*) composed by the smoke of the sacrificial fire set up for the sake of sorcery, or with Caṇḍamuṇḍā with terrible teeth in her mouth surpassing the size of the underworld. She is a teacher of *mantravāda* and *maṇḍalaśikṣā* and an active performer of magic. Growing old, she makes the son of a landlord subjugated by means of roots used for *vaśīkaraṇa*. She is conversant with the magic act called *stambhana* and promises to immobilize the army of the enemies. While passing a toll-station she presents the custom officers flowers causing delusion and remains undisturbed by them (for other details, see Wojtilla 1984, 381-389). By all means Kaṅkālī's versatility in magic must be taken as a complementary skill to her peculiar occupation.

The intimate relation between eroticism in the form of prostitution and Śaivism is quite clear with the Aghori sect, too. As Parry puts it, the prositutes of Benares city "not only visit the burning ghat to worship Shiva there in his form of Lord of the Cremation Ground (*śmaśānanātha*), but each year on the festival of Lolark Chat they used to come to sing and dance at the tomb of Kina Ram ... Moreover, it is said that the bed of a prostitute is equivalent to a cremation ground in that it is an equally proper place for an Aghori to perform his *sādhana*" (Parry 1985, 61). Here I have to mention that according to the Kāmākhyatantra another man's wife or a harlot would serve as the very image of the goddess in order to accomplish *sādhana* (cf. Chattopadhyaya 1978, 14).

Last but not least I would raise the question of the term *śabarī* and its variants *śambhalī* respectively *śambhalā*. Amarasiṃha simply lists *śambhalā* with *kuṭṭanī* (Amarakośa II,6,19) in the sense "bawd, procuress". The Ṛgvidhāna quoted by Goudriaan (1978, 216) says:
śambarīm indrajālaṁ vā māyām etena vārayet (Ṛvidh. 4,23,1) "one will restrain by this (stanza) the *māyā* called *śambarī* and the *māyā* called Indrajāla". I translate *śambarī* as "of a *śambarī*" i.e. "of a female magician", who may be a procuress as a fine example from the poem Kuṭṭanīmata shows. One of the manuscripts of the text bears the title *Śambhalīmata*. Śambhalī/śabarī denotes also a woman belonging to the Śabara/Śavara tribe inhabiting the jungle, especially the Vindhya region. The identification of Parṇaśavarī with Tārā (Chattopadhyaya 1978, 76) is an attempt to reconciliate the "great tradition" with the "little tradition". If this is correct, the specualtion about the origins of certain Tantric traits among the *ādivāsīs* gains some ground. A matrilineally oriented form of society is still prevalent among *ādivāsīs* on the outskirts of Hindu society (cf. Goudriaan 1979, 17). A quite recent report about the

social problems of *ādivāsīs* touches upon the prostitution among *ādivāsī* women (The Sūrya Magazine November 16-30, 1982).

As to the performance of *vaśīkaraṇa*, the texts under review unanimously prescribe the usage of the left hand. There is a uniformity concerning the devices employed: the great majority of these texts speak of the *palāśa* flower (flower of the tree Butea Frondosa) blended with *madirā* (intoxicating liquor). It is significant that the *palāśa* flower has a beautiful red colour since red flowers possess the power of influencing a person's mind (cf. Goudriaan 1978, 320). The idea behind the presentation of flowers is twofold: it aims at the emotion of the person desired and especially "it sets in motion the subjugating power of the flower" (Goudriaan 1978, 320). Kalyāṇamalla, the author of the Anaṅgaraṅga, prescribes that the performer of *vaśīkaraṇa* should repeat the muttering of the mantra and the donation of flowers seven times.

To sum up, the following main points must be highlighted:

1. There is a rich collection of mantras of love magic in the Kāmaśāstras. These texts represent very valuable information about the nature of love magic as a type of the Tantric act called *vaśīkaraṇa*.
2. In the majority of cases, Cāmuṇḍā is the presiding deity of these mantras.
3. The figure of Cāmuṇḍā has a close resemblance with the personal appearance of procuresses known from medieval Sanskrit scriptures on love and related subjects. This circumstance throws light on the social background of popular Tantrism and also compels us to do further research in the direction of tribal cultures as possible sources of certain Tantric traits (cf. Sharma 1977, 180 and 182).
4. Some examples prove the fact that Tantric practices cannot be confined to a restricted period of Indian history. They are of hoary age and survive up to precent days (cf. Goudriaan 1981, relevant chapters).

Bibliography

Archer, 1964. The Koka Shastra, Being the Ratirahasya of Kokkoka and Other Medieval Indian Writings on Love. Tr. by A. Comfort. Preface by W.G. Archer. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Bhattacharji, 1978. S. Bhattacharji, The Indian Theogony. Calcutta: Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay.

Chattopadhyaya, 1978. S. Chattopadhyaya, Reflections on the Tantras. Delhi-Varanasi-Patna: Motilal Banarsidass.

Fodor's Guide, 1971. Fodor's India 1971. E. Fodor, W. Curtis, eds. Hodder and Stoughton.

Goudriaan, 1978. T. Goudriaan, Māyā Divine and Human. Delhi-Varanasi-Patna: Motilal Banarsidass.

---, 1979. S. Gupta-D.J. Hoens-T. Goudriaan, Hindu Tantrism. Leiden-Köln: Brill (Handbuch der Orientalistik IV-2).

---, 1981. T. Goudriaan and S. Gupta, Hindu Tantric and Śākta Literature. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz (A History of Indian Literature, II.2).

Krishnamachariar, 1974. M. Krishnamachariar, History of Classical Sanskrit Literature. Delhi-Varanasi-Patna: Motilal Banarsidass.

Liebert, 1976. G. Liebert, Iconographic Dictionary of the Indian Religions. Leiden: Brill.

Lorenzen, 1972: D.N. Lorenzen, The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas. Two Lost Śaivite Sects. New Delhi: Thomson Press.

Mahalingam, 1967. T.V. Mahalingam, The Cult of Śakti. In: The Śakti Cult and Tārā, ed. by D.C. Sircar. University of Calcutta, p. 17-33.

The Ocean of Story. The Ocean of Story, Being C.H. Tawney's Translation of Somadeva's Kathā Sarit Sāgara. Now edited ... by N.M. Penzer in ten volumes. Delhi-Varanasi-Patna 1968: Motilal Banarsidass.

Parry, 1985. J.P. Parry, The Aghori Ascetics of Benares. In: Indian Religion, ed. by R. Burghart and A. Cantlie. London-New York: Curzon Press - St. Martin's Press, p. 51-78.

Schmidt, 1902. R. Schmidt, Beiträge zur indischen Erotik. Leipzig: Lotus Verlag.

Sharma, 1977. R.S. Sharma, Material Milieu of Tantricism. In: Indian Society. Historical Probings. In Memory of D.D. Kosambi. Ed. by R.S. Sharma and D.N. Jha, Delhi, p. 175-189.

Türstig, 1985. H.G. Türstig, The Indian Sorcery Called abhicāra. In: WZKSA XXIX (1985), 69-117.

Wojtilla, 1984. Gy. Wojtilla, Notes on Popular Śaivism and Tantra in Eleventh-Century Kashmir. In: Tibetan and Buddhist Studies. Commemorating the 200th Anniversary of the Birth of Alexander Csoma de Korös. Ed. by L. Ligeti. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. Vol. II, p. 381-389.

Contributors

Hélène Brunner
16, Route des Joyeuses
2016 Cortaillod
Switzerland

Gérard Colas
55, Rue du Mont Cenis
75018 Paris
France

Vraj Vallabh Dvivedi
12, Professors' Quarters
Sampurnanand Sanskrit University
Varanasi 221002
India

Teun Goudriaan
Instituut voor Oosterse Talen en Culturen
Drift 15
3512 BR Utrecht
Netherlands

Dory Heilijgers-Seelen
Instituut voor Oosterse Talen en Culturen
Drift 15
3512 BR Utrecht
Netherlands

André Padoux
15, Rue Séguier
75006 Paris
France

Jan A. Schoterman
Instituut voor Oosterse Talen en Culturen
Drift 15
3512 BR Utrecht
Netherlands

Silvia Schwarz-Linder
Via Montebello 30
20121 Milano
Italy

Shiníchi Tsuda
1-1-23 Umeda
Adachi-ku
Tokyo 123
Japan

Gyula Wojtilla
Budapest xx.
Pannonia u.3
H-1205
Hungary

Index